

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Karen L. Bartlett

v.

Civil No. 08-cv-00358-JL

Mutual Pharmaceutical  
Company, Inc.

**SUMMARY ORDER**

Attached are the court's rulings on the parties' objections to the deposition testimony of witness Dr. Joel Stein, who has been deemed unavailable to testify at trial under Rule 32(a)(4) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (see doc. 275).

**SO ORDERED.**



\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph N. Laplante  
United States District Judge

Dated: August 24, 2010

cc: Bryan Ballew, Esq.  
Keith M. Jensen, Esq.  
Patrick J. O'Neal, Esq.  
Eric Roberson, Esq.  
Christine M. Craig, Esq.  
Timothy P. Beaupre, Esq.  
Jeffrey D. Geoppinger, Esq.  
Joseph P. Thomas, Esq.  
Paul J. Cosgrove, Esq.  
Linda E. Maichl, Esq.  
Stephen J. Judge, Esq.  
Pierre A. Chabot, Esq.

Bartlett v Mutual

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 1:1 - 1:19

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
3  
4 KAREN L. BARTLETT and Case No.: 08-CV-358-JL  
5 GREGORY S. BARTLETT,  
6  
7 Plaintiffs,  
8 vs.  
9 MUTUAL PHARMACEUTICAL  
10 COMPANY, INC. and UNITED  
11 RESEARCH LABORATORIES, INC.  
12 Defendants.  
13 -----x  
14 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL STEIN, M.D.,  
15 taken by Plaintiffs held at Weill Cornell Medical  
16 Center/New York-Presbyterian Hospital, Division of  
17 Rehabilitation, 525 East 68th Street, New York, New  
18 York 10065, on Thursday, August 6, 2009, commencing  
19 at 2:31 p.m., before Julia Moxsin, a Shorthand  
20 (Stenotype) Reporter and Notary Public within and for  
21 the State of New York.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 10:13 - 10:15

13 Q Please state your name for the  
14 record.  
15 A Joel Stein.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 10:21 - 11:10

21 Q I always like to start depositions,  
22 Dr. Stein, by kind of giving the jury an idea of  
23 where you fit into the picture of Karen  
24 Bartlett's treatment.  
25 And it's my understanding, Doctor,  
00011  
1 that Karen had over a hundred days in about five  
2 hospitals starting at Caritas and then Tufts and  
3 then about 70 days in Mass General, then about  
4 five days in Northeast Rehab, then back to Mass  
5 General for about 11 days, and then finally to  
6 where you were involved in her care and  
7 treatment at Spaulding Rehabilitation Center for  
8 about three weeks.  
9 Does that sound about right to you,  
10 sir?

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 11:13 - 11:15

Objection (10:21 to 11:15):  
-403  
-602  
-611(c)  
-Argumentative  
-Calls for speculation  
-Foundation  
-Misleading

Ruling: Overruled.

Bartlett v Mutual

13 A It's Spaulding Rehabilitation  
14 Hospital, not center. Aside from that, it  
15 sounds accurate.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 11:24 - 12:20

24 Doctor, is it your understanding  
25 that of Karen's over hundred-plus days of  
00012  
1 hospitalizations you were involved in her last  
2 hospitalization; and she was discharged home  
3 from Spaulding Rehabilitation, and you were her  
4 attending doctor there for a portion of her time  
5 at Spaulding?  
6 A Yes, that's correct.  
7 Q And is it correct that you were  
8 Karen Bartlett's attending physician at  
9 Spaulding Rehabilitation for approximately the  
10 last two of her three weeks there, sir?  
11 A That's approximately correct.  
12 Q Is that true because for  
13 approximately the first week of her  
14 hospitalization at Spaulding you were not in the  
15 hospital at that time?  
16 A That's correct.  
17 Q So when you got back on duty, you  
18 immediately became her attending physician; is  
19 that fair?  
20 A That's correct.

Objection:  
-403  
-602  
-611(c)  
-Argumentative  
-Calls for speculation  
-No foundation  
-Misleading

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 13:7 - 13:12

7 Q Sure. Let me go over some of your  
8 qualifications that makes you a highly qualified  
9 physician to be Karen Bartlett's attending  
10 physician, and let me start out with where  
11 you're licensed. You're licensed in both the  
12 states of New York and Massachusetts, correct?

Objection:  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Sustained as to lines 13:7  
through 13:10. Otherwise overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 13:15 - 15:3

15 A I am licensed in both New York and  
16 Massachusetts.  
17 Q And you are triple board-certified,  
18 is that right, Dr. Stein?  
19 A I am board-certified in internal  
20 medicine and in physical medicine and  
21 rehabilitation. I was at one time certified in  
22 electrodiagnostic medicine; however, that  
23 certification, I believe, has lapsed.  
24 Q And you didn't make any attempt to  
25 keep that third board-certification?  
00014

Objection:  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Bartlett v Mutual

1 A That is correct, I chose not to  
2 pursue recertification because my practice  
3 changed.  
4 Q So as we speak you're double  
5 board-certified in internal medicine and  
6 physical medicine and rehabilitation?  
7 A That is correct.  
8 Q And in the past you've been an  
9 instructor in medicine at Harvard Medical  
10 School, correct?  
11 A Correct.  
12 Q You've been an assistant professor  
13 for a time in the Department of Physical  
14 Medicine and Rehabilitation at Harvard Medical  
15 School?  
16 A Correct.  
17 Q Then you were an associate  
18 professor at Harvard Medical School?  
19 A That's correct.  
20 Q Then you became the interim chair  
21 of the department of physical medicine and  
22 rehabilitation at Harvard Medical School?  
23 A That's correct.  
24 Q And since then you have moved on  
25 and you became the professor and chief of a  
00015  
1 division of rehabilitation medicine at Weill  
2 Cornell Medical College of Cornell's University,  
3 correct?

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 15:6 - 15:11

6 A That's correct.  
7 Q Back while you practiced at  
8 Spaulding for approximately eight years, like  
9 1996 or 2004, you were the director of the burn  
10 rehabilitation program at the Spaulding Rehab  
11 Hospital in Boston; is that right?

Objection:  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 15:14 - 17:3

14 A That's correct.  
15 Q Please tell us, Dr. Stein, what is  
16 the relationship between Spaulding  
17 Rehabilitation Hospital and Massachusetts  
18 General Hospital?  
19 A Both hospitals are part of the  
20 partners health care system. They are  
21 affiliated institutions as such.  
22 Q Are they juxtaposed, can you walk  
23 out of one into the other, are they across the  
24 street?  
25 A They are several blocks from one  
00016  
1 another, approximately a ten minute walk.  
2 Q What is the relationship,

Bartlett v Mutual

3 Dr. Stein, between Spaulding Rehab Hospital and  
4 Harvard Medical School?

5 A Spaulding Rehab Hospital is a  
6 Harvard Medical School affiliate.

7 Q Got it. When you were the director  
8 of the burn rehab program at Spaulding, to give  
9 the jury an idea, how many burn units are in the  
10 greater Boston area that might have patients,  
11 treat them, and potentially refer them to  
12 Spaulding for burn rehabilitation?

13 A I'm aware of two acute burn  
14 rehabilitation -- excuse me, two acute burn  
15 centers in the Boston area, one at Mass General  
16 Hospital and the other at Brigham And Women's  
17 Hospital.

18 Q In addition to your teaching, you  
19 have obtained a lot of fellowship and grant  
20 support work for studies you have done, correct?

21 A I have been involved in research,  
22 yes.

23 Q And in addition to your research,  
24 according to your CV, you published some 38  
25 original articles, correct?

00017

1 A That sounds approximately correct.  
2 I haven't counted them today, but that's  
3 approximately correct.

Objection (16:7 to 16:12):  
-402  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (16:18 to 16:25):  
-402  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 17:9 - 17:21

And what are your

10 primary medical areas of interest, Dr. Stein?

11 A My primary area of interest is  
12 stroke rehabilitation and other neurologic  
13 rehabilitation.

14 Q If you could turn, Dr. Stein, to  
15 Exhibit 22. Let me start with that. And that  
16 is a Mass General one-page record, and it's a  
17 nursing note speaking of a conversation that  
18 occurred between a nurse and Karen Bartlett's  
19 husband, Greg, about Sulindac and -- the bottle  
20 of it and that 60 tabs were prescribed and 40  
21 taken. Do you see that, sir?

Objection (17:14 to 17:21):  
-403  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Sustained.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 17:24 - 20:3

24 A I'm reviewing it. Let's see.  
25 (Perusing document.) Yes.

00018

1 Q Do you know whether or not you  
2 would have had access to that page after Karen  
3 Bartlett was transferred to Spaulding  
4 Rehabilitation Hospital?

5 A It's unlikely.

6 Q Exhibit 23 is a typed-up physical  
7 therapy service record.

Objection:  
-402  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Sustained as to lines 17:24  
through 19:7. Otherwise overruled.

Bartlett v Mutual

8           Would you have had access to that  
9 document at Spaulding?

10       A    I don't believe so.

11       Q    Exhibit 24 is a typed-up infectious  
12 disease consult, dated March 4, 2005.

13           Would you have had access to that  
14 while you were at Spaulding treating Karen  
15 Bartlett?

16       A    It's uncertain. Some of these  
17 typed consultations are placed in the electronic  
18 medical record which I did have access to, but I  
19 have no way of knowing from this printout  
20 whether this one was, in fact, in that record or  
21 not.

22           This is a signed copy that was  
23 printed, obviously, and placed in the medical  
24 record. It's unlikely that I would have had  
25 access to the signed copy, but it's possible I  
00019

1 had access to an unsigned copy.

2       Q    Got ya. And the unsigned copies  
3 would be electronically signed in and that's  
4 what you would have had access to via computer?

5       A    Perhaps. I don't know if this was,  
6 in fact, in the electronic medical record. I  
7 can't tell.

8       Q    Thank you. Please give us an idea  
9 of the types of documents that would have been  
10 in the electronic medical record at Mass General  
11 that you likely would have had access to when  
12 you were reviewing Karen's history.

13       A    I would have had access to the  
14 discharge summary, to selected consultations  
15 that were placed in the electronic medical  
16 record; although, I couldn't tell you which  
17 specific ones without having access to that  
18 record.

19           And I would have had access to  
20 laboratory results, to x-ray studies, to  
21 operative reports. Those are the major types of  
22 data I would have had access to.

23       Q    And is it -- is it my presumption  
24 correct that in the care and in the course and  
25 scope of your treatment of Karen Bartlett you  
00020

1 would have accessed electronically what you  
2 deemed relevant to your care and treatment from  
3 Mass General's records?

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: Page 20, Line 6

6       A    Yes.

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 20:9 - 21:4

9       Q    And why do you do that?

Bartlett v Mutual

10 A I access records as needed to help  
11 me in the care of the patient so I understand  
12 their medical condition and the treatments that  
13 they might require.

14 Q Have you had a chance to review  
15 some or all of the Spaulding Rehab records that  
16 pertained to your participation in Karen  
17 Bartlett's care and treatment before we began  
18 that deposition today, sir?

19 A I have had a chance to review some  
20 of those records which were provided to me by  
21 you. It does not appear to be a complete record  
22 of the chart, but I do believe it contains all  
23 of my own notes.

24 Q And but for getting the records  
25 from me because you're now at Weill Cornell, you  
00021

1 wouldn't have had access to them unless you  
2 called your former facility, Spaulding, and got  
3 them yourself, correct?

4 A That is correct.

Objection (20:24 to 21:4):  
-402  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled,.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 21:7 - 21:19

7 Exhibit 26, Dr. Stein, is a second  
8 infectious disease consult. It is dated March  
9 24, 2005, again, it's the signed version.

10 Can you take a few moments to look  
11 at that and tell us whether or not you would  
12 have likely had access to the electronic  
13 unsigned version of that, please?

14 A It's possible, but I have no way of  
15 knowing for certain.

16 Q From a review of your notes and  
17 discharge summary, Dr. Stein, is it correct to  
18 state that you had knowledge of the reported  
19 history of Sulindac and said use?

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 21:22 - 22:5

22 Q It is. Your discharge summary is  
23 Exhibit 34, sir.

24 A (Perusing document.) As best I can  
25 determine from my note, my knowledge was that  
00022

1 she had been treated with a nonsteroidal  
2 anti-inflammatory drug, but I'm not -- I did not  
3 record what specific medication that was here.  
4 I couldn't say whether I was aware of it or not,  
5 but I didn't record it.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 22:11 - 22:15

## Bartlett v Mutual

11 So is it correct to state,  
 12 Dr. Stein, that you had knowledge that she took  
 13 NSAIDs, you know Sulindac's an NSAID, but you  
 14 didn't make any specific reference to which  
 15 NSAID she took?

Objection:  
 -403  
 -602  
 -611 (c)  
 -Compound  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 22:18 - 25:6

18 A That is correct.  
 19 Q Okay. Exhibit 26, page 476, the  
 20 bottom. It is the last page, Dr. Stein, the  
 21 impression of this infectious disease fellow  
 22 states "this is a 45-year-old woman with TEN,  
 23 likely secondary to NSAIDs who currently has a  
 24 multifocal pneumonia with associated effusions."  
 25 Do you see that?

Objection (22:19 to 25:6):  
 -402  
 -602  
 -611 (c)  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation

Ruling: Sustained as to lines 23:17  
 through 25:6. Otherwise overruled.

00023

1 A Yes.  
 2 Q Was that your understanding when  
 3 you were the attending physician by the end of  
 4 your treatment of Karen Bartlett?  
 5 A Regarding the cause of her -- I'm  
 6 not sure I understand your question. It's a bit  
 7 broad. Regarding her pneumonia, regarding her  
 8 TEN, regarding the nonsteroidal etiology?  
 9 Q Regarding her TEN and etiology.  
 10 A It was my understanding that  
 11 nonsteroidal use was entertained as one of the  
 12 possible causes of her TEN. It was not entirely  
 13 clear at the time. To -- to me that had been,  
 14 you know, whether that was, in fact, the cause,  
 15 but I was aware of that.  
 16 Q Thank you, Doctor.  
 17 And because Exhibit 27, the ID  
 18 attending note is in cursive, you would not have  
 19 had that, right, or have had access to that,  
 20 right?  
 21 A Presumably not.  
 22 Q Exhibit 28 is the discharge  
 23 summary, and it is -- on the last page you will  
 24 see it is dictated by a Sally Morton, NP.  
 25 Do you know what NP stands for, Dr.

00024

1 Stein?  
 2 A Nurse practitioner.  
 3 Q Would you have -- let me ask you,  
 4 if you hypothetically had access to two  
 5 infectious disease consults, the very ones that  
 6 we just very quickly went over and a nurse  
 7 practitioner's indication of a discharge  
 8 summary, where would you have placed your focus  
 9 in terms of getting a picture about this  
 10 patient?  
 11 A I think that's a very difficult  
 12 question to answer. I think it depends with  
 13 regard to what particular aspect of her care.  
 14 If, for example, the question was what  
 15 infections does she have or what treatment would  
 16 be appropriate, certainly I would generally



Bartlett v Mutual

17 defer to the infectious disease consultant.

18 There are other aspects of the  
19 history that might or might -- or the course  
20 that might or might not be more accurately  
21 reflected in the nurse practitioner's note.

22 Q Got it.

23 A I wouldn't say one trumps the other  
24 inherently.

25 Q Would it be fair to say you would  
00025

1 look at all the data, but if you were looking at  
2 questions regarding infectious disease, I'm  
3 asking you would you put more credence in the  
4 infectious disease doctor's statements about  
5 that than a nurse practitioner's?

6 A Generally, yes.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 25:8 - 25:15

8 Would you have likely seen Exhibits  
9 29 and 30, which are the history and physical  
10 and discharge summary respectively from  
11 Northeast Rehab Hospital?

12 A Most likely not. Occasionally  
13 these records are duplicated, xeroxed and sent  
14 with the patient's chart, but I would say that's  
15 infrequent and unlikely to have been the case.

Objection:  
-402  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation  
-Calls for speculation

Ruling: Sustained.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 25:17 - 28:11

17 What, if any, affiliation does  
18 Northeast Rehab Hospital have with MGH or  
19 Harvard Medical School?

20 A None that I'm aware of.

21 Q In retrospect in reviewing your  
22 records, do you know why Ms. Bartlett went from  
23 Mass General for approximately, give or take, 70  
24 days to Northeast Rehab for about five days and  
25 then back to MGH and then to Spaulding Rehab,  
00026

1 specifically, why Northeast Rehab and then  
2 Spaulding Rehab; do you know what the answer is  
3 to that?

4 A I could speculate, but I don't know  
5 for certain. My understanding is the patient  
6 resided in New Hampshire. Northeast Rehab is  
7 located in New Hampshire, and it's quite  
8 possible she preferred to be closer to home.  
9 But that's speculation.

10 In terms of coming to Spaulding  
11 afterwards, she obviously had a deterioration in  
12 her medical status while at Northeast Rehab. I  
13 assume that she chose not to return there, or  
14 her physicians advised her to stay closer and  
15 come to our program instead.

16 Q Got it. Thank you, Doctor.

Objection (25:21 to 26:15):  
-602  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation  
-Calls for speculation

Ruling: Sustained.

## Bartlett v Mutual

17 Let's go to Exhibit 31. Let me  
 18 know when you are there, please.  
 19 A All set.  
 20 Q Is that April 27th history and  
 21 physical the first formal document that's  
 22 created when Karen Bartlett would have arrived  
 23 as a new inpatient at Spaulding Rehab?  
 24 A It's the first physician  
 25 documentation I would expect.  
 00027

Objection (26:16 to 28:11):  
 -602  
 -611(c)  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

1 Q And that tells us and it reported  
 2 that Ms. Bartlett, Karen, had been at Mass  
 3 General from February 4, '05 and that she had a  
 4 toxic epidermal necrolysis at greater than 40  
 5 percent of her total body surface area, correct?  
 6 A I'm looking where it says that in  
 7 the notes, if you give me a moment. (Perusing  
 8 document.)  
 9 Admitted on 2/4/05 with right toxic  
 10 epidermal necrolysis, the greater than 40  
 11 percent total body surface area.  
 12 Q And two sentences later it says she  
 13 spent 65 days in the hospital. Did you  
 14 understand that to be a reference to how long  
 15 she was at Mass General?  
 16 A Yes.  
 17 Q And then it tells us a couple of  
 18 lines later she was able to be discharged to  
 19 Northeast Rehab on April 14, 2005, right?  
 20 A Correct.  
 21 Q And you understood that to be that  
 22 she went from MGH for about 65 days to Northeast  
 23 Rehab, correct?  
 24 A That's correct.  
 25 Q And then the next sentence tells us  
 00028  
 1 she was subsequently -- that means after  
 2 Northeast Rehab -- back at Mass General,  
 3 correct?  
 4 A That's correct.  
 5 Q And then she is admitted to Mass  
 6 General on 4/18, so four or five days at  
 7 Northeast Rehab, and now it's April 27th, so she  
 8 is in Northeast Rehab for about -- or she's back  
 9 at Mass General for about 11 days before she  
 10 arrives at Spaulding; does that sound right to  
 11 you?

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 28:14 - 28:25

14 A It looks more like nine days to me.  
 15 Q Okay. Thank you.  
 16 And the doctor who signed this and  
 17 wrote this up was a colleague of yours named  
 18 Dr. Lie-Nemeth, correct?  
 19 A Yes.  
 20 Q Dr. Lie-Nemeth reports that her  
 21 hospital course, referring to Mass General, was  
 22 significant because she was intubated, she had a

Objection (28:16 to 28:18):  
 -602  
 -611(c)  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (28:20 to 28:25):  
 -602  
 -611(c)  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation  
 -Improper publishing

Ruling: Overruled.

Bartlett v Mutual

23 tracheostomy, and she had a vancomycin resistant  
24 bacteremia, in addition to other things,  
25 correct?

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 29:3 - 29:19

3 A I'm reviewing -- I'm sorry. What  
4 page are you on?

5 Q Same page. I'm on like the fifth  
6 line, under HPI.

7 A Intubation, trach placement, VRE,  
8 yes. Okay. That's accurate.

9 Q And SVT stands for supraventricular  
10 tachycardia, Doctor?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Is that fancy for an abnormally  
13 increased heart rate?

14 A It's more precise, but it  
15 essentially -- yeah, an example of an abnormally  
16 increased heart rate. It's one type.

17 Q And ARDS is acute respiratory  
18 distress syndrome?

19 A That's correct, adult.

Objection:

-602  
-611(c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 30:1 - 32:21

1 Q And that she also had a deep vein  
2 thrombi of the right common femoral vein.

3 A Deep venous thrombosis, correct.

4 Q And she also had MSSA, patient  
5 developed hyperemia. Can you tell us what that  
6 is, please?

7 A She had a methicillin sensitive  
8 staph aureus. That's what MSSA stands for,  
9 bacteremia. And she had anemia. Her hyperemia  
10 is a different issue. That's on another line.

11 Q And the very last sentence of that  
12 paragraph it says -- it tells us what her sodium  
13 level was, and it says that level was secondary  
14 to her being dehydrated; is that right?

15 A That is correct.

16 Q Okay. Now that we have that,  
17 please paint the picture, if you will, medically  
18 speaking, of what Karen's status was upon  
19 presentation to Spaulding.

20 A She was obviously had had a serious  
21 illness with a very complex and lengthy hospital  
22 course related to her toxic epidermal necrolysis  
23 and related complications as detailed in the  
24 note.

25 At the time of her arrival, she

00031

1 continued to have difficulty with swallowing.

2 She had a nasogastric feeding tube in place to

3 assist with that. She had a tracheostomy tube

4 for her respiratory difficulties. She was

Objection (30:1 to 30:15):

-602  
-611(c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled,.

## Bartlett v Mutual

5 experiencing generalized anxiety. She had some  
6 corneal damage from the TEN, which was being  
7 managed with topical medications and followed by  
8 an ophthalmologist, and she was deconditioned  
9 and in need of physical rehabilitation services.

10 Q Tell us to the extent you can,  
11 Doctor, with the benefit of the notes that  
12 you've gone back and reviewed at my request --  
13 and thank you for doing so -- why Karen needed  
14 to go back to Mass General a second time after  
15 she had a brief hospitalization at Northeast  
16 Rehab?

17 A It sounds like there were multiple  
18 factors. I wasn't involved in her care or the  
19 decision to bring her back to Mass General, but  
20 as documented in this note, it sounds as though  
21 there were concerns about her wounds and that  
22 was why she was referred for evaluation at Mass  
23 General.

24 The dehydration with the sodium of  
25 155 is a fairly serious medical condition and  
00032

1 required, as noted here, a substantial volume of  
2 intravenous fluids, which I assume was the  
3 primary reason for her rehospitalization at Mass  
4 General.

5 Q What insight, if any, do you have  
6 on what caused that significant dehydration?

7 A I'd be speculating, most likely she  
8 had inadequate amounts of fluid that she was  
9 receiving through her nasogastric tube combined  
10 with perhaps higher losses of fluid through  
11 breathing through her trach and perhaps through  
12 perspiration or wounds or other sources. But  
13 it's a combination of either not enough water in  
14 or too much out or somewhat of both.

15 Q Is one of the very important things  
16 that you began to manage after you later got  
17 back to the hospital and became Karen's  
18 attending physician, is her nutrition either  
19 through a nasogastric tube or later on a  
20 gastrostomy tube inserted into her abdomen?  
21 A That is correct.

Objection (31:10 to 31:16):

-602  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation  
-Vague  
-Calls for speculation

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (32:15 to 32:21):

-602  
-611(c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 32:23 - 35:9

23 Is it not uncommon for patients to  
24 become dehydrated despite being on a feeding  
25 tube through their nose or a feeding tube  
00033

1 through their stomach?

2 A It does occur.

3 Q Why does it occur, Doctor? In  
4 other words, one would logically think if  
5 someone has a feeding tube through their nose or  
6 feeding through their stomach, it's being  
7 monitored, the perhaps assumption would be that  
8 you wouldn't get dehydrated. Why does it occur?  
9 A The management of patient's fluid

Objection (32:23 to 33:8):

-402  
-602  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation  
-701  
-702  
-Improper opinion by NRE

Ruling: Sustained (through line 33:25).

Bartlett v Mutual

10 and nutrition is not always given sufficient  
11 priority by medical staff, or maybe they lack  
12 knowledge of that.  
13 In addition to that, estimates of  
14 what people need are often inaccurate. You  
15 know, rule of thumbs formulas that are used may  
16 not, in fact, reflect any individual patient's  
17 needs. And if monitoring is not performed  
18 frequently, then because the person is unable to  
19 take fluid by mouth it's very easy for them to  
20 end up with abnormal electrolytes.

21 For an individual who is able to  
22 drink by mouth and has access to water, you  
23 would normally feel thirst and would replenish  
24 your fluids automatically without requiring any  
25 medical intervention.

00034

1 Q Thank you, Doctor. I'll go to page  
2 3 of Dr. Lie-Nemeth's history and physical, and  
3 under functional history, she reports that Karen  
4 requires contact guard assistance for transfers.  
5 What does that mean?

6 A It means she needed someone  
7 standing next to her with a hand placed on her  
8 body for guidance for moving from the bed to the  
9 wheelchair or the wheelchair to standing or  
10 other activities, changes in position or  
11 location.

12 Q Does that mean that Dr. Lie-Nemeth  
13 believes she is not able to walk alone without  
14 assistance?

15 A It means that she would not be safe  
16 at that point in time to get out of bed and walk  
17 by herself.

18 Q Okay. So in her next sentence  
19 where she says she can walk for 220 feet, do you  
20 interpret that to mean is that she can walk that  
21 far with assistance?

22 A It's unclear from this note. It  
23 may be that the patient requires the contact  
24 guard assistance for the change in position, but  
25 once she is upright and walking, she may not  
00035

1 require that much assistance. It is somewhat  
2 ambiguous.

3 Q And 220 feet -- I guess 300 feet is  
4 a football field, so 220 feet is something like  
5 being able to make it from the end zone to the  
6 other side's 30 yard line. With that as a  
7 reference guide, do you interpret that sentence  
8 to mean that she is unable to walk more than  
9 that approximately 70 yards?

Objection (34:1 to 34:5):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (34:12 to 35:9):  
-602  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation  
-Calls for speculation

Ruling: Sustained (through line 35:24).

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 35:12 - 35:24

12 A It's difficult to say. Oftentimes  
13 we will comment on how far a patient can walk.  
14 We don't generally walk them to exhaustion or  
15 until they fail. So I would interpret this as

Bartlett v Mutual

16 she can walk at least 220 feet, but it is  
 17 possible that she could walk further.  
 18 I'll mention that that's a  
 19 fairly -- for someone being admitted to a  
 20 rehabilitation hospital, that's a pretty good  
 21 distance. It is not the size of a football  
 22 field inside the hospital, so there are limits  
 23 to how far a patient can physically walk on the  
 24 unit.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 36:10 - 36:12

Before I go on with this  
 11 page, please flip to Exhibit 33, bottom right,  
 12 1548. Tell me when you are there, please.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 36:20 - 38:1

20 A I see it. I have it.  
 21 Q Okay. And hopefully the next page  
 22 of that shows that that is signed by a Dr. Jacob  
 23 Holzer. Does your copy show that?  
 24 A Yes.  
 25 Q And Dr. Jacob Holzer is a  
 00037  
 1 psychiatrist that you worked with, let me try,  
 2 for years at Spaulding Rehabilitation?  
 3 A I don't recall exactly how long he  
 4 worked there. I believe it was perhaps two or  
 5 three years. I don't recall.  
 6 Q Okay. And did you participate in  
 7 the care and treatment of many patients with  
 8 Dr. Holzer in his two or three years there?  
 9 A Yes.  
 10 Q Did you find him to be a competent,  
 11 qualified psychiatrist who aided you in taking  
 12 care of your patients?  
 13 A Yes.  
 14 Q Dr. Holzer reports in his first  
 15 paragraph about two-thirds of the way down, in  
 16 the middle it says "was followed by the burn  
 17 psychiatry service." Do you see that?  
 18 A Yes.  
 19 Q And in the last sentence,  
 20 Dr. Holzer reports "psychiatry is requested to  
 21 consult as a follow-up to MGH course." Do you  
 22 see that, sir?  
 23 A Yes.  
 24 Q Now, let's go back to  
 25 Dr. Lie-Nemeth, and she reports under review of  
 00038  
 1 symptoms --

Objection (36:25 to 38:1):  
 -402  
 -602  
 -611 (c)  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation  
 -Calls for speculation  
 -Improper publishing

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 38:8 - 40:13

## Bartlett v Mutual

8 Q She reports "positive for anxiety."  
 9 Go down under psych: She reports "mood is  
 10 anxious." And flip to the next page, please,  
 11 under psych No. 4, second or third sentence, she  
 12 reports "psychiatry at Mass General has  
 13 recommended discontinuation of Seroquel." Do  
 14 you see that?

15 A Yes.

16 Q When you reviewed these records,  
 17 would it have been your understanding and is it  
 18 now that Karen Bartlett was seen at the  
 19 suggestion of the doctors at Mass General that  
 20 she see psychiatrists there, so Dr. Lie-Nemeth's  
 21 recommendation that she see a psychiatrist at  
 22 Spaulding would have been at least a second  
 23 facility who saw a need for Karen Bartlett to  
 24 get psychiatric evaluation or treatment,  
 25 correct?

00039

1 A She ordered a psychiatry consult.  
 2 It seems to have been aware of the MGH  
 3 recommendation to continue psychiatric care, and  
 4 I think in her own assessment, although I can't  
 5 speak for her, and only per her written record  
 6 but seemed to feel it was appropriate.

7 Q Okay. And in that same paragraph  
 8 4, Dr. Lie-Nemeth not only suggests or  
 9 recommends psychiatry, but that she follow-up  
 10 with psychology, as well, correct?

11 A That's correct.

12 Q And the psychologist that was --  
 13 then evaluated Ms. Bartlett pursuant to  
 14 Dr. Lie-Nemeth's recommendation was Dr. Richard  
 15 Goldberg?

16 A That's correct.

17 Q For how many years, if at all, did  
 18 you work with Dr. Richard Goldberg?

19 A Approximately 16 years.

20 Q Did you find him in those  
 21 approximately 16 years to be a qualified,  
 22 capable psychologist who aided you in the care  
 23 and treatment of your patients?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Back to Dr. Holzer's comment

00040

1 followed by burn psychiatry service at MGH,  
 2 first up, for how many years do you best  
 3 estimate that you were at Spaulding Rehab and  
 4 potentially getting referrals from the burn  
 5 service at MGH?

6 A I don't recall. Several years, I'd  
 7 have to look at my own resume to see. The years  
 8 that I indicated that I was the director of the  
 9 burn program would have been the approximate  
 10 same years.

11 Q On your resume it says '96 to 2004,  
 12 so eight, nine or ten years?

13 A That sounds about right.

Objection (38:8 to 38:15):

-402  
 -602  
 -611 (c)  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation  
 -Calls for speculation  
 -Improper publishing

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (38:16 to 39:16):

-602  
 -611 (c)  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation  
 -Calls for speculation  
 -Improper publishing

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (39:17 to 39:24):

-402  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (39:25 to 40:13):

-402  
 -611 (c)  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation  
 -Calls for speculation

Ruling: Overruled.



## Bartlett v Mutual

8 Was it common for MGH severely  
9 burned patients with having never seen a  
10 psychiatrist or psychologist before, to your  
11 knowledge, to be referred by MGH Burn Service to  
12 psychiatry?

13 A My understanding was that it was  
14 common practice to refer patients with severe  
15 burns at Mass General to psychiatry regardless  
16 of any premorbid conditions they may have had.

17 Q When you say "regardless of any  
18 premorbid conditions," is what that means for  
19 people who might not understand that that they  
20 had never seen a psychologist or psychiatrist  
21 before that in their life?

22 A Correct. Regardless of whether  
23 they had that care or not previously it was  
24 commonly ordered there.

25 Q It may or may not seem obvious to  
00042

1 those listening to us, why was it common for  
2 people in a burn unit to be sent to psychiatry?

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 42:5 - 45:4

Objection (41:8 to 41:24):  
-402  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Sustained.

Objection (41:25 to 42:12):  
-402  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation  
-Calls for speculation

Ruling: Sustained.

5 A The nature of burn injuries are  
6 that they are both painful and disabling and are  
7 rather devastating events when they are severe  
8 for the recipient. There is substantial medical  
9 literature documenting the psychiatric impact of  
10 major trauma and burns in particular, so for  
11 that reason I think this is fairly routine  
12 practice at most burn centers.

13 Q And Dr. Holzer's, the psychiatrist,  
14 initial or his May 4th consultation with Karen,  
15 that would have come the day after you arrived  
16 back at the hospital and first saw Karen on May  
17 the 3rd, correct, sir?

18 A That is correct.

19 Q And your first written note is  
20 Exhibit 33, 1518 on the bottom, correct?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And there you record, amongst other  
23 things, that you're considering a pulmonary  
24 consult regarding a possible tracheostomy  
25 decannulation, correct?

00043

1 A Right. I think it was -- I just  
2 said pulmonary consult regarding possible trach  
3 decannulation. I don't think I was considering  
4 it, I believe I was planning it.

5 Q Thank you. Tell us what that is,  
6 please?

7 A Trach decannulation is removal of  
8 the tracheostomy tube.

9 Q And tracheostomy tube is what,  
10 please?

11 A It's a tube placed into the trachea  
12 to allow the patient to breathe through the  
13 tube. It goes into the front part of the neck.

Objection (42:13 to 42:18):  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (42:19 to 42:21):  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (42:22 to 43:4):  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation  
-Improper publishing

Ruling: Overruled.



## Bartlett v Mutual

14 Q And it is your -- do you have an  
15 understanding of for how long at Mass General  
16 and her approximate 65 days there or her about  
17 four days at Northeast Rehab or her about eight  
18 days at second time at Mass General that Karen  
19 was breathing through her neck by means of a  
20 tracheostomy?

21 A I'd have to go back and review the  
22 Mass General records. Generally speaking,  
23 someone with her type of medical condition would  
24 have probably received a tracheostomy fairly  
25 early in her course and had it for the majority  
00044

1 of that time, but I'd have to verify that.

2 Q Please go to Exhibit 32 and let me  
3 know when you are there.

4 A Okay.

5 Q And that is a couple of days before  
6 you arrived back at the hospital, an ocular or  
7 eye consult of Karen that was done on April 29,  
8 2005, correct?

9 A That's correct.

10 Q And that was done by a Dr. Tsai who  
11 works at the Massachusetts Eye and Ear  
12 Infirmary, right?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q And Dr. Tsai under allergies lists  
15 NSAIDs, comma, Sulindac, right?

16 A Actually, that may have been  
17 recorded by the staff at Spaulding. I believe  
18 it was. I don't believe that's her record, but  
19 ours.

20 Q Got ya. So the way you read this  
21 from results down would have been Dr. Tsai's  
22 writing and above that was probably this  
23 Spaulding recommendation?

24 A That's correct.

25 Q Okay. What Dr. Tsai, then, reports  
00045

1 is that Karen on April 29, '05 now at Spaulding  
2 for a couple of days is that she has early  
3 scarring at corneas and severe dryness, right?

4 A That's Correct.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 45:7 - 45:24

Objection (43:14 to 44:1):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-Calls for speculation  
-No foundation  
-Misleading

Ruling: Sustained.

Objection (44:5 to 44:9):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (44:10 to 44:13):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (44:14 to 44:19):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation  
-Improper publishing

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (44:16 to 44:24):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (44:25 to 45:18):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-Calls for speculation  
-No foundation  
-Improper publishing

Ruling: Sustained as to lines 45:11  
through 45:18. Otherwise overruled.

7 Dr. Tsai's fourth recommendation is  
8 to tape eyelids shut when patient is sleeping,  
9 right?

10 A That's correct.

11 Q Would that have been followed every  
12 night while Karen was at Spaulding to tape her  
13 eyelids shut when she was sleeping?

14 A It should have been, but I can't --  
15 I would have to review the nursing records to  
16 see if that's the case. Generally speaking,  
17 these recommendations would be followed  
18 carefully.

19 Q Why would it have been your

Bartlett v Mutual

20 understanding that this ophthalmologist or eye  
21 doctor is recommending that Karen now  
22 approximately 80 days after she first got to  
23 Mass General is still having a recommendation to  
24 have her eyelids shut, taped at night?

Objection (45:19 to 45:24):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-Calls for speculation  
-No foundation  
-Assumes facts not in  
evidence

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 46:3 - 49:8

3 A Generally speaking, patients who  
4 are having corneal damage or dryness or other  
5 issues related to corneal injury, one of the  
6 major treatments is to protect them from  
7 excessive air exposure and using a combination  
8 of lubricants during the daytime and taping the  
9 eyelids shut at night is fairly common.

10 Q Dr. Tsai recommends a follow-up on  
11 May 2nd, and the next page shows us that she saw  
12 Karen Bartlett on May 2nd, correct?

13 A That is correct.

14 Q Now, when Mass eye/ear  
15 ophthalmologists were seeing Karen while she was  
16 soon to become a patient of yours at Spaulding,  
17 where were they physically seeing her,  
18 Dr. Stein?

19 A At Mass's Eye and Ear Infirmary.

20 Q And tell us how she got there and  
21 how far it was from Spaulding.

22 A It is physically attached to Mass  
23 General Hospital, although it is an independent  
24 facility, and it's approximately several blocks.  
25 It's a ten-minute walk. Driving it can be  
00047

1 anywhere from five minutes to an hour-and-a-half  
2 depending on traffic.

3 Q So she would have been physically  
4 transported there, how?

5 A Typically by ambulance or perhaps  
6 by a chair car or ambulette. I don't know in  
7 her case which was used.

8 Q Is a chair car the same thing as  
9 ambulette?

10 A Yes, they're used interchangeably.

11 Q What is an ambulette, please?

12 A It's a van that is designed for  
13 transporting patients with medical needs. It's  
14 usually for patients that are wheelchair  
15 requiring so that the patient is assisted in the  
16 wheelchair into the van and the wheelchair is  
17 secured, and they can be driven safely that way  
18 as opposed to an ambulance where a patient is  
19 brought in by stretcher.

20 Also, the degree of medical  
21 supervision is substantially greater in an  
22 ambulance. And our standard practice at  
23 Spaulding at the time was to use the lesser  
24 degree of medical resources when medically  
25 appropriate.

00048

1 Q Sure. The very next page on May

Objection (46:10 to 46:13):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-Calls for speculation  
-No foundation  
-Improper publishing

Ruling: Overruled.

## Bartlett v Mutual

2 3rd show us that she had a consult or a  
 3 follow-up with the burn clinic and the  
 4 requesting doctor was you, Dr. Joel Stein,  
 5 correct?  
 6 A I am listed as a requesting M.D. I  
 7 don't actually know who wrote the order. It may  
 8 have been written prior -- probably was written  
 9 prior to my assuming her care because it would  
 10 have been scheduled since I assumed her care on  
 11 May 3rd. It was probably written by Dr.  
 12 Lie-Nemeth.

13 Q Thank you, Doctor.  
 14 And same question: How physically  
 15 would Karen have gotten from Spaulding to go  
 16 back for a follow-up to the burn clinic?

17 A Either by chair car or by  
 18 ambulance. I'm not certain which.

19 Q And do you know whether that -- can  
 20 you tell whether that follow-up occurred on  
 21 April 3rd?

22 A It can't be determined from this  
 23 note. I believe it did occur, but I can't  
 24 verify that. It is not atypical for the Burn  
 25 Service not to provide a written response on  
 00049

1 this form, so the absence of that does not  
 2 indicate that it did not occur.

3 Q The next page shows it was a third  
 4 consult with an ophthalmologist from Mass Eye  
 5 and Ear in this instance with a Dr. Azar  
 6 Dimitri, correct, sir?

7 A Actually it is signed by Dr. Tsai,  
 8 if I'm looking at the same note. This is 1560?

Objection (48:1 to 48:12):  
 -602  
 -611 (c)  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation  
 -Calls for speculation  
 -Improper publishing

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (49:3 to 49:8):  
 -602  
 -611 (c)  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation  
 -Calls for speculation  
 -Improper publishing

Ruling: Sustained.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 50:1 - 51:1

Q Let's go to the last page. Does  
 2 that appear to be a record of a fourth consult  
 3 for Karen with Mass Eye and Ear while she was at  
 4 Spaulding?

5 A Is this 1562?

6 Q Yes, sir.

7 A Yes, it does appear to be that way.

8 Q And on all four of those consults,  
 9 the allergies listed are NSAIDs, Sulindac,  
 10 correct?

11 A I have to verify that, but I  
 12 imagine so.

13 (Perusing document.) That is  
 14 correct.

15 Q And all we spoke about is the eyes.  
 16 Also, on the follow-up for the burn clinic and  
 17 the consult for the G-tube placement, which is  
 18 the feeding tube into her stomach, on both of  
 19 those consults the allergies listed is also  
 20 NSAID Sulindac, correct?

21 A That is correct.

22 Q Now, go back and move to  
 23 Dr. Lie-Nemeth's original history and physical.

Objection (50:1 to 50:14):  
 -602  
 -611 (c)  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation  
 -Improper publishing

Ruling: Sustained.

Objection (50:15 to 50:21):  
 -602  
 -611 (c)  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation  
 -Improper publishing

Ruling: Sustained.

Bartlett v Mutual

24 She states in the physical examination "there is  
25 a stage II ulcer on Karen's back with no  
00051  
1 drainage." What does that mean, Doctor?

Objection (50:22 to 51:1):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation  
-Improper publishing

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 51:10 - 53:9

10 A That refers to a decubitus ulcer  
11 that was graded as stage II. Staging system  
12 indicates the depth. Stage I is generally  
13 redness. Stage II is superficial skin abrasion  
14 or breakdown. So this is a relatively mild  
15 degree of skin breakdown, and her exam indicates  
16 that there was no drainage from the wound, which  
17 is a -- generally a favorable finding.

18 Q And then her plan underlined is  
19 decreased functional status secondary to toxic  
20 epidermal necrolysis syndrome, correct?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q Secondary generally means cause,  
23 right; in other words, do you interpret  
24 Dr. Lie-Nemeth's note to mean that she believes  
25 that Karen had decreased functional ability  
00052

1 because of her TEN?

2 A That's correct.

3 Q And she tells us the components of  
4 that decreased functionality are that she has  
5 weakness in her legs, she has decreased  
6 activities of daily living, she has less mobile  
7 and she has less ability to swallow?

8 A That's correct.

9 Q And her plan to hopefully treat  
10 these medical issues of Karen's is a number of  
11 things, including physiatry, PT, OT,  
12 speech-language, breathing therapy and  
13 psychology, amongst other things, correct?

14 A I'm not sure what you mean by  
15 "breathing therapy," respiratory therapy if  
16 that's what you mean.

17 Q Yes, it is what I meant, and I was  
18 going to ask you that. Other than that  
19 correction, is that list all true?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And let's start with that. What is  
22 respiratory therapy, Doctor?

23 A Respiratory therapists are trained  
24 in the management and assistance of patients  
25 with pulmonary issues with respiratory issues.  
00053

1 They, in a hospital setting, would typically  
2 assist with trach care, with suctioning, to  
3 remove secretions from the tracheostomy tube  
4 with oxygen therapy, with anything involving  
5 breathing aids or apparatuses.

6 Q Respiratory therapy is the  
7 extremely important task of making sure  
8 someone's tube through which they are breathing  
9 through their neck is functional?

Objection (51:18 to 51:21):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation  
-Improper publishing

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (51:21 to 52:2):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation  
-Improper publishing

Ruling: Sustained.

Objection (52:3 to 52:20):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation  
-Improper publishing

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (53:6 to 53:9):  
-402  
-611 (c)  
-701  
-702  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation  
-Improper opinion by NRE

Ruling: Sustained as to "extremely  
important." Otherwise overruled.

Bartlett v Mutual

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 53:12 - 54:9

12 A That is a component of their task,  
 13 correct. They share that task with others, such  
 14 as nursing but that is correct.  
 15 Q What is physiatry, Dr. Stein?  
 16 A Physiatry is another term for the  
 17 medical specialty of physical medicine and  
 18 rehabilitation.  
 19 Q And PT that means you -- Dr. --  
 20 your colleague, Dr. Lie-Nemeth, had planned for  
 21 her physical therapy?  
 22 A Correct.  
 23 Q And she had planned for  
 24 occupational therapy?  
 25 A Correct.

00054

1 Q Now, when she planned for Karen's  
 2 speech-language pathology, please tell us what  
 3 that means.  
 4 A Speech-language pathology is  
 5 synonymous speech therapist, the term that they  
 6 prefer; and they deal with several issues, and  
 7 in this particular patient, they would have been  
 8 focusing on her swallowing since I'm not aware  
 9 that she had any difficulty speaking.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 54:11 - 54:25

11 The goals were to have a modified  
 12 independent to independent level for all  
 13 activities of daily living and mobility,  
 14 correct?  
 15 A That's correct.  
 16 Q Tell us what that means.  
 17 A Independent level would mean that  
 18 you can do everything yourself. An able-bodied  
 19 person with no medical issues or disability  
 20 would be able -- would be independent.  
 21 Modified independent is when you  
 22 are able to achieve the activity on your own,  
 23 but require a device or some modification of the  
 24 activity to perform it. For example, walking  
 25 with a cane would be modified independence.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 55:13 - 58:7

13 On the last page, Dr. Lie-Nemeth  
 14 has "an estimated length of stay of two weeks  
 15 and potential is good."  
 16 Does that mean she thinks there is  
 17 a good chance it might be a two-week hospital

Objection (55:13 to 56:8):  
 -602  
 -611 (c)  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation

Ruling: Sustained through line 56:3.  
 Otherwise overruled.

Bartlett v Mutual

18 stay?

19 A Give me one moment. (Perusing  
20 document.)

21 Q Sure.

22 A So she is estimating the stay at  
23 two weeks. In terms of potential being good, I  
24 think what she is referring to is her overall  
25 rehabilitation potential is good. I don't think  
00056

1 that's a reflection on the accuracy of the two  
2 weeks estimate, but more on her overall  
3 likelihood of improvement and success.

4 Q Okay. Thank you, Doctor. And what  
5 it turned out to be is a approximately  
6 three-week hospitalization. We know that from  
7 your discharge summary, Exhibit 34, correct?

8 A That's correct.

9 Q Now, she was -- your colleague said  
10 that her recommendation was to continue Karen on  
11 Valium. What is Valium, Doctor?

12 A Valium is a benzodiazepine  
13 medication. It's used as an anxiolytic and as a  
14 sleep aid, as well.

15 Q Does anxiolytic mean and in Karen's  
16 situation did you understand that it was being  
17 given to her because of her anxiety?

18 A That's correct.

19 Q Is it also a powerful sedative and  
20 muscle relaxer?

21 A It has both of those  
22 characteristics, as well.

23 Q And the plan was to wean her off  
24 methadone which was -- means to hopefully get  
25 her off it, correct?  
00057

1 A That's correct.

2 Q Would it have been your  
3 understanding that she was being given methadone  
4 for pain management?

5 A Yes. It's commonly used in the  
6 burn unit, at least it was at the time at Mass  
7 General as a pain medication, and it has a  
8 favorable pharmacologic profile that they have  
9 reasons to select it.

10 Q Now, she also reports that  
11 psychiatry at Mass General had recommended  
12 taking Karen off of Seroquel; is that right?

13 A That is correct.

14 Q What would have been your  
15 understanding as to why psychiatry at Mass  
16 General wanted to take her off that drug and  
17 tell us what that drug is, please?

18 A I can't comment on their rationale.  
19 I don't have access to their notes.

20 Seroquel is an atypical  
21 antipsychotic medication. It is used as a sleep  
22 aid and as an antianxiety medication to some  
23 extent, as well. It has a variety of complex  
24 actions that are not fully understood, including  
25 the suggestion that it might be of some benefit  
00058

1 for depression, as well, although that's not so

Bartlett v Mutual

2 clear.

3 Q As we have pointed out, the  
4 recommendation to consult psychiatry and  
5 psychology was basically following up on  
6 something that already occurred at Mass General?

7 A That's correct.

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 59:19 - 59:20

19 Q Exhibit 33, 1528, at the bottom.

20 Tell me when you're there, please.

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 59:25 - 62:22

25 A Okay, I have that.

00060

1 Q Is that your May 9th note regarding  
2 Karen?

3 A At the top, yes.

4 Q Those are your initials about  
5 halfway down the page?

6 A That's my signature.

7 Q Okay. Thank you.

8 Tell us what's going on there in  
9 terms of your assessment and plan. This would  
10 be approximately Karen's 11th day at the  
11 hospital, right?

12 A Roughly.

13 Q Tell us what's going on at that  
14 time, please.

15 A She had been decannulated, her  
16 tracheostomy tube had been removed. She was  
17 doing well from a respiratory standpoint. She  
18 had had a modified barium swallow and had not  
19 done well in terms of her swallowing safety.  
20 That was attributed to concerns about anxiety  
21 and also the presence of the tracheostomy tube.

22 She was continuing on therapeutic  
23 feeds which indicates small amounts of feeding  
24 given by the speech therapist rather than more  
25 substantial amounts of food for nutritional

00061

1 purposes, and our plan was to repeat the  
2 swallowing study shortly.

3 We had also -- were changing the  
4 tube feedings that were going through her  
5 nasogastric tube at that time to what are called  
6 boluses which are larger amounts given less  
7 frequently. And a community outing was being  
8 planned.

9 Q Let's start with the community  
10 outing being planned, what's that about, please?

11 A Part of your program for  
12 transitioning patients back to the community is,  
13 when feasible, to get them outside the hospital  
14 and to participate in activities in the



Bartlett v Mutual

15 community under the supervision of the  
16 therapist.

17 Q What would that entail; in other  
18 words, where would you go, what would you do?

19 A The activities varied. I couldn't  
20 say without seeing the therapist notes what was  
21 done here, but the source of things that were  
22 commonly done were is there is a science museum  
23 several blocks from the hospital, patients would  
24 often go there on an outing, they would also  
25 sometimes go to the nearby North Station Boston  
00062

1 Garden and do shopping there or something.

2 Q All right. Tell us from a lay  
3 perspective what this modified barium swallow  
4 study is, please, and what it is designed to  
5 tell a physician.

6 A A modified barium swallow study is  
7 an x-ray study that is performed. It's a video  
8 of the swallowing, and the patient is given a  
9 material that is visible on the x-ray images to  
10 chew and swallow or to drink. Different  
11 textures are given and the patient's swallow  
12 mechanism is observed, whether the food goes  
13 down the esophagus, whether it goes down into  
14 the trachea and the airways where it doesn't  
15 belong. Those sorts of things are observed.

16 Q Tell us about the difficulties, if  
17 any, of having both a tracheostomy, in other  
18 words the tubes that you are breathing through  
19 your neck, as well as a nasogastric tube, so you  
20 are getting fed through your nose down to your  
21 abdomen; does that simultaneous link of medical  
22 devices create problems?

Objection (62:16 to 63:4):

-402  
-701  
-702  
-Argumentative  
-No foundation  
-Improper opinion by NRE

Ruling: Sustained.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 62:25 - 64:17

25 A Both nasogastric tube and a  
00063

1 tracheostomy tube can interfere with swallowing  
2 to some extent, and the combination certainly  
3 could cause additive effects in terms of  
4 interfering with swallowing.

5 Q What was going on with -- in your  
6 estimation with Karen's difficulty swallowing?

7 A I think at that moment in time, or  
8 looking back?

9 Q Looking back.

10 A Looking back, it appears that there  
11 were probably multiple factors. The presence of  
12 the tracheostomy tube was probably a  
13 contributing one, the nasogastric tube, as well.  
14 In addition she was subsequently evaluated by an  
15 ENT physician and found to have evidence of a  
16 vocal cord paralysis.

17 Q We all understand a vocal cord is  
18 what we need to speak, but what was your  
19 understanding of what caused the vocal cord  
20 paralysis, if you have an understanding?



## Bartlett v Mutual

21 A If I could just correct that and  
22 say right vocal cord paralysis.

23 Q Okay. Thank you.

24 A The cause of the paralysis was  
25 uncertain. Dr. Suzuki, Bruce Suzuki, who  
00064

1 evaluated the patient raised the possibility  
2 that it might have been related to her  
3 intubation, but it was uncertain.

4 Q Let me kind of ask a global  
5 question. Looking back from your review of your  
6 records regarding Karen Bartlett and those of  
7 your colleagues at Spaulding Rehabilitation  
8 Hospital, in your estimation was essentially all  
9 of Karen Bartlett's physical medical issues a  
10 result of and compatible with the fact that she  
11 had TEN?

12 A All of her issues appeared to  
13 derive ultimately from that original inciting  
14 factor.

15 Q The inciting factor being the fact  
16 that she had TEN?

17 A Correct.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 64:21 - 65:18

Let's go to Exhibit 31, page 2,  
22 and there your colleague Dr. Lie-Nemeth lists 19  
23 medications. And that's what she shows up at  
24 Spaulding that Karen is then on, correct?

25 A That's correct.  
00065

1 Q Excluding the multivitamin and any  
2 others that you have to exclude, are essentially  
3 all of those medications, looking back, Dr.  
4 Stein, in your view, medications that Karen  
5 needed as a result of her TEN?

6 Another way of stating that is had  
7 she never had TEN, she wouldn't have been on  
8 these 19 medications maybe except a  
9 multivitamin?

10 A As far as I know, she was not on  
11 any of these medications prior to her  
12 hospitalization, so I think it's safe to assume  
13 they are all being used to treat the  
14 complications of the TEN.

15 Q And the vocal cord paralysis,  
16 secondary to possibly intubation would have been  
17 one of many examples of things that occur as a  
18 result of TEN, fair?

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 65:21 - 67:16

Objection (64:21 to 64:25):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (65:1 to 65:14):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation  
-Argumentative

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (65:15 to 65:22):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation  
-Argumentative

Ruling: Overruled.

21 A Right. Yes I would agree with  
22 that.

23 Q Let's go, on the same topic, to

Bartlett v Mutual

24 your discharge summary, please, Exhibit 34.

25 Tell me when you're there.

00066

1 A Okay.

2 Q Is that your signature on page 2?

3 A That is my signature.

4 Q And you list on discharge eight

5 medications that Karen is then on, correct?

6 A That's correct.

7 Q Looking back and based upon a

8 reasonable degree of medical certainty, were all

9 of those medications that she was on upon

10 discharge maybe except the multivitamins all as

11 a result of Karen having TEN and the

12 complications thereof?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Let's go back to, we previously

15 referenced Dr. Holzer's typed-up psychiatry

16 consult. It's in the middle of Exhibit 33, tell

17 me when you're there, 1548 at the bottom.

18 A Okay.

19 Q And Dr. Holzer, the psychiatrist

20 there, reports on her mental state, towards the

21 right, "became tearful during meeting discussing

22 length of hospital course." The very last line

23 of the same page she reports, "she does report

24 having a difficult time feeling demoralized,

25 upset about length of hospitalization, misses

00067

1 home."

2 Do you see those entries?

3 A Yes.

4 Q I occasionally ask stupid, obvious

5 questions, but is it your understanding that

6 those symptoms, those signs would have been as a

7 result of Karen having TEN in this extremely

8 long hospitalization at many different

9 hospitals?

10 A Yes.

11 Q When Dr. Holzer reports, under

12 mental state line, reports chronic

13 claustrophobic SXS.

14 First of all, do you know what that

15 is an abbreviation for?

16 A Symptoms.

Objection (66:14 to 67:10):

-602  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation  
-Argumentative  
-801  
-802

Ruling: Sustained.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 67:19 - 68:8

What do you

20 interpret Dr. Holzer's reporting there when she

21 has claustrophobic symptoms, chronically --

22 strike that.

23 First of all, when he says

24 "chronically," does he mean that the symptoms

25 are appearing over a long period of time?

00068

1 A It's hard to be certain what his

2 intention was. I would interpret this as

3 indicating that this may actually precede her

Objection (67:19 to 68:8):

-602  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation  
-Argumentative  
-Calls for speculation  
-801  
-802

Ruling: Sustained.

Bartlett v Mutual

4 hospitalization. It's not rare for people who  
5 are otherwise fully functional and not in  
6 psychiatric treatment to have feelings of  
7 claustrophobia the same way some people are  
8 afraid of snakes or heights.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 68:21 - 69:15

21 Q He also, in his clinical  
22 impression, Dr. Holzer, reports "now recovering  
23 with wide areas of burns complicated hospital  
24 course." Do you see that?  
25 A Yes.  
00069  
1 Q And then on the next page  
2 Dr. Holzer says, second line, "right now would  
3 recommend continuing with Valium as needed,  
4 which patient reports is helpful for phobic  
5 symptoms and acute anxiety." Is that right?  
6 A Yes.  
7 Q How would you have interpreted  
8 that; what does that mean?  
9 A He is recommending continuing use  
10 of the Valium as needed which the patient has  
11 found helpful for some of her symptoms.  
12 Q When he says "phobic symptoms,"  
13 what do you understand that to mean?  
14 A Fear, I'm not sure of what. It's  
15 unclear from his note.

Objection (68:21 to 69:6):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation  
-Argumentative  
-Improper publishing  
-801  
-802

Ruling: Sustained.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 69:20 - 70:2

20 Who was the pulmonologist, based  
21 upon your review of the records, that was  
22 involved in Karen's care at Spaulding?  
23 A Dr. Douglas Johnson.  
24 Q Can you please help me find his  
25 first note. I think I found it on page 1523,  
00070  
1 and it's about two-and-a-half pages long,  
2 correct?

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 70:7 - 71:9

7 A Yes, I see it on 54 on -- yes, the  
8 bottom of 1523.  
9 Q Yes, sir. And would you,  
10 Dr. Stein, have reviewed that as part and parcel  
11 of your care and treatment?  
12 A I would have, yes.  
13 Q Tell us, then, from your  
14 perspective what Dr. Johnson, the lung  
15 specialist, the pulmonologist, is reporting

Bartlett v Mutual

16 there that would have been important for you?

17 A Perhaps I can skip to the  
18 impression recommendations, which is the essence  
19 of the notes. He had some concerns based on  
20 prior chest x-ray and his examination that she  
21 might have a left-sided pleural effusion, and he  
22 recommended that we get particular chest x-rays  
23 to evaluate that.

24 He removed a suture that had been  
25 left in place. He changed one of her  
00071

1 medications or recommended its change to as  
2 needed, the albuterol. And he recommended a  
3 culture and gram stain of a sputum specimen.

4 Q Let's start with pleural effusion.

5 What is that, please, Doctor?

6 A Fluid around the lung.

7 Q And that can be caused by many  
8 things; can it not?

9 A That's correct.

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 71:16 - 74:10

16 Q What was going to be used to  
17 attempt to hopefully overcome that issue?

18 A In terms of assessing the issue, a  
19 chest x-ray was advised with what are called  
20 decubitus films, where the patient lies on their  
21 side to see if there is fluid there, whether it  
22 is -- how much of it is present and whether it  
23 is mobile or if it's fixed in location.

24 Q And was that -- and this was a May  
25 4th note, the day after you started actively  
00072

1 treating Karen. Tell us as time went on was  
2 that pleural effusion, did it resolve?

3 A It appeared to have been improving  
4 and required no further treatment during her  
5 Spaulding stay.

6 Q This lung doctor, Dr. Johnson,  
7 reports that he removed a tracheostomy retention  
8 suture; is that correct?

9 A That's correct.

10 Q Please tell us what that is and why  
11 it was done.

12 A It's a suture that's placed at the  
13 time of the insertion of the tracheostomy tube  
14 to hold it in place and keep it from falling  
15 out. Typically the sutures are removed because  
16 after a period of time the tracheostomy is more  
17 secure and the risk of it coming out is less  
18 substantial.

19 In her case because of her multiple  
20 medical issues perhaps and multiple  
21 institutions, the suture was left in place  
22 longer than is typical and he removed it.

23 Q Typically how long are these  
24 tracheostomy sutures left in?

25 A I'm not certain.

Bartlett v Mutual

00073

1 Q In relation, to give us a visual,  
2 of the Adams apple, where are these sutures?

3 A The tracheostomy tube would be near  
4 the Adams apple and the suture would be right  
5 adjacent to it that would be holding it to the  
6 skin there.

7 Q And a suture could be, to use an  
8 analogy which I'm sure is inaccurate, if we are  
9 talking about stitches here, how many stitches  
10 would that be?

11 A One.

12 Q The actual tracheostomy is round,  
13 correct?

14 A I'm not sure if I understand by the  
15 tracheostomy. The tube itself is cylindrical,  
16 it has various other components. There is a  
17 flange on the outside of it, various other  
18 pieces.

19 Q The part that holds to your neck is  
20 at the end of a cylinder and it's round; is that  
21 right or wrong?

22 A Correct. In essence, correct.

23 Q How does one stitch hold a round  
24 presumed piece of plastic to your neck?

25 A Imagine you have a tube inserted

00074

1 into another tube, which is what's happening  
2 here. The tracheostomy tube is going into the  
3 trachea, which is the body's own breathing tube.  
4 It rests there, and it is not inclined to move  
5 unless it is pulled out. So what the suture  
6 does is prevent it from inadvertently being  
7 pulled out or falling out, but it can't  
8 otherwise move around very much because it is  
9 held in place by the surrounding tissues. I  
10 probably need to draw you a diagram.

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 74:17 - 76:3

17 Q Let's go to the next page 1522. Is  
18 the top entry there the entry of the  
19 psychologist, Dr. Richard Goldberg?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Can you please do us a favor and  
22 read into the record because I can't read it.

23 A "5/04/05 psychology reviewed notes  
24 by psychiatry. Dr. Holzer recommends continuing  
25 with Valium. Patient appears" -- I'm not sure I  
00075

1 can read that word -- "in mood, not tearful  
2 today," underlined "feels she is finally  
3 adjusting better to staff. Notice she has  
4 well" --

5 Q -- groomed?

6 A It says "well groomed." I think  
7 that -- I'm not sure. Notice she is well  
8 groomed, perhaps? It is unclear what that  
9 middle word is.

Objection (74:21 to 76:2):

-602  
-Calls for speculation  
-No foundation  
-Misleading/confusing  
-801  
-802

Ruling: Sustained as to lines 74:21  
through 75:15. Otherwise overruled.

Bartlett v Mutual

10 "Sitting up in chair with" -- I  
 11 can't read the next few words. The next line,  
 12 "told me she finally feels she is making some  
 13 progress, happy that trach retention is removed  
 14 and looks forward to eventual decannulation.  
 15 And no trach, no complaints."  
 16 Q And so what she is reporting there  
 17 is the suture that was just removed by  
 18 Dr. Johnson?  
 19 A That's correct.  
 20 Q And did it give her -- is it easier  
 21 to breath when the trach retention is removed?  
 22 Why is she reporting, to your estimation, that  
 23 she is better off?  
 24 A It's unlikely that she was  
 25 physically able to feel or be aware of the  
 00076  
 1 suture. I imagine it was more the idea of it  
 2 being removed.  
 3 Q Right.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 76:22 - 78:22

22 Q Please go to Exhibit 33, 1529 at  
 23 the bottom. Tell me when you are there, sir.  
 24 A 15 --  
 25 Q -- 29.  
 00077  
 1 A Okay.  
 2 Q What is that page of May 10, '05?  
 3 A This is a team rounds note.  
 4 Q What is that?  
 5 A In a rehab hospital, there is a  
 6 periodic meeting of the team, generally at least  
 7 once a week. It varies from institution to  
 8 institution, and frankly, I don't recall at the  
 9 time there how often we were doing this.  
 10 But the physician, the case manager  
 11 and the therapy team, nursing typically, get  
 12 together and review a patient's progress, any  
 13 barriers to continue progress and they try to  
 14 determine a discharge plan and estimate the  
 15 length of stay and the level of functioning at  
 16 discharge.  
 17 Q Is a accurate way to define your  
 18 role in Karen's treatment from 5 -- from May 3rd  
 19 through her discharge on May 19th, is that --  
 20 well, of course, you are not a pulmonologist or  
 21 a burn surgeon. You were her attending  
 22 physiatrist which meant that you led the team in  
 23 terms of deciding what ultimately would be Karen  
 24 Bartlett's care and treatment?  
 25 A That's correct.  
 00078  
 1 Q On May 10th she was seen by  
 2 Dr. Richard Goldberg, psychologist. Again, if  
 3 you would be kind enough again to read his entry  
 4 on the next page, I'd appreciate it.  
 5 A "Patient seen for psychotherapy.

Objection (78:1 to 78:21):  
 -602  
 -611 (c)  
 -Argumentative  
 -No foundation  
 -Calls for speculation

Ruling: Overruled.

Bartlett v Mutual

6 She is anxious today for two reasons, one,  
7 husband last night had tightness in his chest  
8 and was taken to Holy Family Hospital Methuen  
9 for observation; two, she failed" I think the  
10 word is -- "failed the MBS test."  
11 Q Let me stop you right there. Is  
12 that right, true, and accurate?  
13 A It's not a -- I would never -- it's  
14 not a pass/fail exam. It's a common  
15 colloquialism among team members, but it's not a  
16 very accurate way to describe it.  
17 Q When the team member says that,  
18 what does it mean to you?  
19 A It means he is a psychologist and  
20 the patient told him that she failed, but I --  
21 it's not a pass/fail exam.  
22 Q And then you tell us, how did she

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 79:5 - 80:11

please proceed with reading that,

6 Doctor.

7 A "Despite anxiety she has been  
8 walking."

9 Q Worked up?

10 A I think it might be "walking around  
11 unit with minimal assistance. She does not need  
12 increase in anxiolytic medications. She said  
13 that she wants to get reports on husband. He  
14 has been feeling" -- I think it might be --  
15 "overwhelmed by her being hospitalized at the  
16 same time he works as lineman" -- I think that  
17 says -- "and takes care of the house." I'm not  
18 sure what that says works at something. Let's  
19 see, something "history of claustrophobia and is  
20 very sensitive to changes. Will follow  
21 closely."

22 Q Thank you. I'd like to ask you a  
23 question about some of Karen's doctors at MGH.  
24 First off, as a psychiatrist would  
25 it be fair to say you're much better at judging  
00080

1 someone's prominence in your field, psychiatry,  
2 than some other field like burn surgery; would  
3 that be a fair general statement?

4 A I guess.

5 Q With that said, would it be your  
6 understanding, both then and now, that Karen's  
7 three surgeons, burn surgeons, particularly at  
8 MGH that of Dr. John Schultz, Dr. Robert  
9 Sheridan and Dr. John Ryan are highly regarded,  
10 preeminent burn surgeons widely known for their  
11 experience and skill?

Objection (79:5 to 79:21):

-602  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation

Ruling: Sustained.

Objection (79:22 to 80:25):

-402  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation

Ruling: Sustained.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 80:14 - 83:12

Bartlett v Mutual

14 A I believe you're referring to  
 15 Colleen Ryan, not John.  
 16 Q I think I'm referring to John.  
 17 A John Sheridan -- Rob Sheridan  
 18 rather, John Schultz, and I think Colleen Ryan.  
 19 In any case, it's an outstanding  
 20 team there. Dr. Sheridan and the rest of the  
 21 team are nationally renown as burn surgeons, and  
 22 it is a leading center for burn.  
 23 Q And you would include both Dr. Ryan  
 24 and Dr. Schultz in that category, as well?  
 25 A Sure.

00081

1 Q Who did this ENT consult on --  
 2 A That consult on 5/10 was performed  
 3 by Dr. Bruce Suzuki.  
 4 Q And like all the consults, that  
 5 would have been done on your direction, correct?  
 6 A Or Dr. Lie-Nemeth's. I believe  
 7 this is probably at my request.  
 8 Q And what would you have taken away  
 9 from this ear nose and throat consult?  
 10 A He identified a right vocal cord  
 11 paralysis, which he attributed possibly to the  
 12 intubation. She also had pharyngeal weakness,  
 13 and he was suggesting a gastrostomy tube to help  
 14 eliminate the need for the nasogastric tube.  
 15 He also recommended speech evaluate  
 16 her for any speech difficulties but noted that  
 17 she was actually pretty well compensated for her  
 18 right vocal cord weakness. She was, in fact,  
 19 receiving speech and language pathology services  
 20 already at this time.  
 21 Q He says he is considered a peg, and  
 22 I take it that's a gastronomy tube.  
 23 A A peg is another term for  
 24 gastrostomy tube, that's correct.  
 25 Q And that was later put in instead

00082

1 of her nasogastric tube?  
 2 A That's correct.  
 3 Q And on the next day, May 11th, you  
 4 have a note, and that would have been for time  
 5 reference, approximately two weeks into her  
 6 hospitalization at Spaulding, correct?  
 7 A I'm sorry. On 5/11?  
 8 Q Yes, sir.  
 9 A Roughly, yes.  
 10 Q And roughly two weeks into her  
 11 hospitalization is one of the things in your  
 12 assessment and plan you're speaking of is that  
 13 she is, in fact, going to get this gastrostomy  
 14 tube instead of her nasogastric tube.  
 15 A I indicated that I would discuss it  
 16 with the patient and then prepare for actually  
 17 making that -- prepare for that procedure by  
 18 putting her on Fragmin instead of Coumadin.  
 19 Q Those are both blood thinners,  
 20 correct?  
 21 A Anticoagulants, correct.  
 22 Q And you're prescribing these  
 23 anticoagulants/blood thinners because of her



## Bartlett v Mutual

24 deep vein thrombi, correct?

25 A That is correct, because of her  
00083

1 history of deep venous thrombosis.

2 Q A deep vein thrombi is not an  
3 uncommon occurrence of either surgeries or  
4 lengthy hospital stays, correct?

5 A It's a common complication seen in  
6 patients in her circumstance with complex  
7 hospital courses.

8 Q Okay. Deep vein thrombi are  
9 anticoagulation problems where there is too much  
10 clotting, and the clotting forms a clot usually  
11 in the legs or arms, and the concern is it might  
12 travel to the lungs or pulmonary system, fair?

Objection (83:8 to 83:12):  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation  
-Misleading

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 83:15 - 87:17

15 A Broadly stated, yes.

16 Q You told us that Karen went ahead  
17 and got this gastrostomy tube placed in her  
18 stomach, correct?

19 A That's correct.

20 Q Who did that procedure and where  
21 was it done?

22 A It was done in Mass General  
23 Hospital by radiology -- interventional  
24 radiology. I'm not sure I know the  
25 radiologist's name.

00084

1 Q So, again, that would have involved  
2 the transfer of Karen by ambulance or ambulette  
3 to Mass General for that procedure?

4 A That's correct. She would not have  
5 been admitted there. It was simply a same-day  
6 procedure.

7 Q That would have been a couple of  
8 hours at MGH and then however long it took to  
9 transfer her back?

10 A That's correct.

11 Q What day was that done, please?

12 A It appears to have been done on May  
13 16, 2005.

14 Q You're on page which that tells you  
15 that?

16 A I'm seeing that in my note on page  
17 1544. In fact, there is a note from the  
18 resident on duty that evening confirming that  
19 she returned after peg placement.

20 Q The resident's note is on the top  
21 of 1544?

22 A On 1545, it's titled PM&R ROC, and  
23 it stands for resident on call.

24 Q Got it. Can you read us that  
25 resident's note, please?

00085

1 A "Subjective: Called to see patient  
2 regarding return from peg placement. Patient  
3 complains of increased gas. Instructions state

Bartlett v Mutual

4 may use peg if positive bowel sounds.

5 Objective: Abdomen plus bowel sound times 4,

6 slightly decreased, mild diffusely tender.

7 Abdomen without rebound. Assessment plan one,

8 status postpeg, positive bowel sound. Okay to

9 use peg. No tube feeds times 24 hours per nurse

10 instructions."

11 Q And when he says "okay to use peg,"

12 does that mean you can turn the peg on or off?

13 A It means it is okay to provide the

14 patient fluids and feedings through the tube, as

15 well as medications.

16 Q Was Karen getting both medication

17 and nutrition through this gastrostomy tube that

18 was surgically inserted in her stomach or

19 abdomen?

20 A Correct.

21 Q And this resident physician made

22 that note on May 15th at 9:00 o'clock?

23 A 9:00 p.m.

24 Q What is his or her name?

25 A David Wang.

00086

1 Q You would have had many resident

2 physicians who have been involved in the care

3 and treatment of Karen and ultimately reporting

4 to you their observations, correct?

5 A She was not on a teaching service.

6 I don't believe I had a resident following her

7 at the time, so there were probably a few

8 involved, but not many.

9 Q Would those doctors who were in the

10 residency program had been participating in the

11 team meetings that you were ultimately in charge

12 of?

13 A I don't believe they were in her

14 case.

15 Q So the team meetings would have

16 comprised what health care providers, please,

17 that you were in charge of?

18 A Generally or the specific meetings

19 that occurred with her? I can say generally who

20 attends, but --

21 Q Generally, please.

22 A Generally it includes the

23 physician, the case manager, a nurse, the

24 physical, occupational, and speech therapists.

25 That's the core team.

00087

1 Q Okay. Thank you.

2 I forgot to ask you something about

3 the pulmonologist's note which I will find, and

4 I'm going back and finding it. Here it is.

5 Dr. Johnson, the pulmonologist,

6 notes on page 25 he speaks of a question of

7 tracheobronchitis; what is that and what was he

8 questioning, please?

9 A Tracheobronchitis is an infection

10 of the trachea and bronchi. It is generally a

11 less severe condition than pneumonia; and he was

12 raising the possibility, although it was

13 ultimately not felt to be the case.

Bartlett v Mutual

14 Q Thank you.

15 How many swallow studies did Karen  
16 have at Spaulding?

17 A It appears she had two.

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 88:5 - 89:22

5 Is this your entry on the bottom of  
6 1545 on May 17, '05?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Can you read us your assessment  
9 plan, please?

10 A "Begin use of G-tube and G-tube  
11 removed. Resume Coumadin, continue Fragmin  
12 overlap, continue IV fluids until tolerating  
13 G-tube feeds."

14 Q Tell us what that means, "continue  
15 IV fluids until tolerating G-tube feeds."

16 A Because she had just had the  
17 gastrostomy tube placed, some patients have some  
18 certain transient weakness of the stomach  
19 muscles, if you will, or reduced stomach  
20 activity. So some people have difficulty in  
21 absorbing the tube feeds when initially begun  
22 after placement of the tube.

23 To ensure she didn't become  
24 dehydrated we were continuing the intravenous  
25 fluids until we were confident that she was able  
00089

1 to tolerate adequate amounts of fluid and  
2 nutrition by the gastrostomy tube.

3 Q This IV fluid was through IV in her  
4 arm or centrally located or where?

5 A I don't see it in my notes. I'm  
6 not certain.

7 Q It could have been either?

8 A Correct. More than likely it was  
9 in her arm, but I can't verify that.

10 Q And then teach us, please, what is  
11 the preferred or more effective route at  
12 delivering medications, if there is one, between  
13 an IV and a G-tube.

14 A It's not a question of being more  
15 effective. It depends on the medication.  
16 Generally speaking, we prefer to avoid  
17 intravenous medications when we can because it  
18 creates a greater risk to the patient. You can  
19 get infections through an IV and that sort of  
20 thing. So in general when we can provide oral  
21 medications or via a gastrostomy tube, we prefer  
22 to do that.

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 90:8 - 91:8

8 Q Okay. Let's go to your discharge  
9 summary, please.

Bartlett v Mutual

10 A What exhibit is that?

11 Q Thirty four.

12 And in your approximate third  
13 sentence, fourth line, you said she had a  
14 lengthy hospital course and required intubation  
15 and tracheostomy placement, as well as  
16 nasogastric tube feedings.

17 So that's referenced to which  
18 hospitalizations, please?

19 A Multiple hospitalizations prior to  
20 her Spaulding arrival, so as you have identified  
21 previously, initial hospitalization at a  
22 community hospital and then subsequent transfer  
23 to Mass General at some point, et cetera.

24 Q Thank you.

25 And would it be fair to say that  
00091

1 while it wasn't your primary mission to  
2 determine the etiology of Karen Bartlett's TEN,  
3 it was something, a piece of data that was  
4 important to you just like all other data in  
5 caring for the patient, and obviously it had  
6 potential implications regarding what you might  
7 advice the patient to avoid in the future to  
8 obviously hopefully avert this situation again?

Objection (90:25 to 91:8):  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation  
-Argumentative  
-Assumes facts not in  
evidence  
-Calls for speculation

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 91:13 - 93:2

13 A Yes.

14 Q Thank you.

15 And in your second sentence you  
16 write, "the exact etiology was" -- you are  
17 referring to her TEN and it says -- "exact  
18 etiology was unclear. The possibility of  
19 nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs" -- or  
20 NSAIDs for short -- "or some food were  
21 considered."

22 Is that what you wrote?

23 A That's what I wrote.

24 Q Tell us, please, Dr. Stein, are you  
25 aware of any patient that you have ever treated  
00092

1 or known of where a conclusion was made that  
2 they got TEN from or diagnosis was made that  
3 they actually got TEN from Chinese food or food  
4 or a stomach flu?

5 A I have not cared for any patients  
6 in whom that was the -- aside from this  
7 possibility, but no other patients for whom that  
8 was entertained as a diagnosis.

9 Q Let me be broader then.

10 Have you ever seen or heard of any  
11 study which in your view or estimation where you  
12 were told that establishes a causal link or  
13 raises a strong evidence of a causal link  
14 between any food or Chinese food and getting TEN  
15 or toxic epidermal necrolysis?

16 A I have not seen any literature to  
17 that affect; although, this is not an area of

Objection (91:24 to 93:2):  
-402  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation  
-Calls for speculation  
-701  
-702  
-Improper opinion by NRE

Ruling: Overruled.

Bartlett v Mutual

18 expertise for me, and it's not literature that I  
19 normally would seek out or read.  
20 Q Understood. Is it also fair to say  
21 that while you know of a lot of literature and  
22 hear about a lot of literature as the -- as a  
23 doctor, even though it's not in your particular  
24 area of expertise, where you might read the  
25 JAMA, you might occasionally read an NAJM, even  
00093  
1 though it's not in your particular area of  
2 expertise, fair?

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 93:5 - 93:6

5 A I do read articles in general  
6 medical journals about a variety of topics.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 93:11 - 94:3

11 Have you ever read or heard of a  
12 published case series or even a case report,  
13 meaning a single case, where any doctor in any  
14 publication ever reported in his or her  
15 estimation a link at all between any food,  
16 Chinese food included, and getting TEN, toxic  
17 epidermal necrolysis?  
18 A I have not seen any such reports.  
19 Q Bearing in mind that the Mass  
20 General infectious disease consults we have  
21 looked at including the one of March 24, '05  
22 that diagnosed TEN likely secondary to NSAIDs,  
23 and both infectious disease consults had NSAID  
24 at the top of their differential without mention  
25 of Chinese food as a possible cause; is it also  
00094  
1 your understanding that the NSAID Sulindac would  
2 have been the more likely cause of Karen  
3 Bartlett's TEN and not some food she ate?

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 94:6 - 94:12

6 A I have indicated I am not an expert  
7 in this area. My limited knowledge of it would  
8 lead me to suspect that the nonsteroidal  
9 anti-inflammatory medication might be a more  
10 likely candidate, but it's a very limited  
11 knowledge of this area.  
12 Q But bearing in mind it's, what you

Objection (93:11 to 94:11):  
-402  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation  
-Calls for speculation  
-701  
-702  
-Improper opinion by NRE  
-602  
-801  
-802

Ruling: Sustained as to lines 93:11  
through 93:25 (up to "possible cause").  
Otherwise overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 95:1 - 95:8

Bartlett v Mutual

1 Q Sure. Is what supports the  
2 testimony you just gave that the NSAID Sulindac  
3 is more likely the cause of Karen Bartlett's TEN  
4 is the lack of ever hearing any study that ties  
5 food with TEN and the lack of ever hearing any  
6 colleague of yours in your medical career tell  
7 you that they believed anyone they had ever seen  
8 got TEN from food, Chinese food included?

Objection (95:1 to 95:8):

-402  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation  
-Misrepresents prior  
testimony  
-701  
-702  
-801  
-802  
-Improper opinion  
testimony from NRE  
-Misleading

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 95:11 - 95:18

11 A To reiterate, it has not been a  
12 topic that I have invested a lot of time in, so  
13 you are correct in your conjecture that I have  
14 not heard about this from others, you know as  
15 food as a cause, but I -- there is a long list  
16 of things that may cause it that I haven't heard  
17 about, so I really have to reemphasize that this  
18 is not an area of expertise of mine.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 95:21 - 96:5

21 My questions obviously asked about  
22 food or Chinese food. Let me be a little  
23 broader, Doctor.

24 Have you ever heard of any study  
25 that claims there is a causal link or is  
00096

1 evidence of a causal link between -- I used the  
2 word any food before, let me elaborate, I mean  
3 food poisoning, seafood, fruit, Mexican food,  
4 Greek food on the one hand, and getting TEN on  
5 the other hand?

Objection:

-402  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation  
-Misrepresents prior  
testimony  
-701  
-702  
-801  
-802  
-Improper opinion  
testimony from NRE  
-Misleading

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 96:8 - 96:19

8 A I'm unaware of any such studies --  
9 let me restate that. I have not seen any such  
10 studies.

11 Q And of course, there's studies in  
12 the next question.

13 Have you ever heard of any  
14 published case series of even a single case  
15 report where any doctor in the world ever  
16 suggested that there might be a link between any  
17 type of food, food poisoning, seafood, fruit  
18 Italian, Mexican, Greek on the one hand and  
19 getting TEN on the other hand?

Objection (96:11 to 96:19)

-402

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: Page 96, Line 22

Bartlett v Mutual

22 A I have not seen any such reports.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 96:24 - 99:13

It is a medical term for a  
25 stomach flu, fair?

00097

1 A Sure.

2 Q Have you ever heard of any study  
3 that supports a causal link or is evidence of a  
4 causal link between a stomach flu or  
5 gastroenteritis on the one hand and getting TEN  
6 on the other hand?

7 A No.

8 Q Have you ever heard any doctor at  
9 any time in your career or read any medical  
10 record any time in your career that lead you to  
11 believe that any doctor thought, conjectured,  
12 concluded, or diagnosed that the stomach flu or  
13 gastroenteritis on one hand caused TEN on the  
14 other hand?

15 A It was alluded to in this patient's  
16 record, aside from that, no.

17 Q You and Keith Jensen, for the  
18 record, have never met before, correct, Dr.  
19 Stein?

20 A Not in person, no.

21 Q We have spoken approximately how  
22 many times before your deposition, sir?

23 A I believe twice.

24 Q Okay. And how many of those  
25 approximate two conversations were substantive;  
00098

1 let me define substantive as conversations that  
2 actually involved your care and treatment of  
3 Karen Bartlett as opposed to  
4 when-can-you-be-available-for-your-deposition-  
5 type communications?

6 A Just one of them.

7 Q When was that conversation?

8 A Early this week.

9 Q Did I advise you that you had the  
10 right to, if you chose, to send me a bill for  
11 your customary hourly rate to compensate you for  
12 time spent away from your practice of seeing and  
13 treating patients for the time you spent  
14 reviewing these records of your former patient  
15 or speaking with me or giving your deposition  
16 today?

17 A Yes.

18 Q What is your customary and hourly  
19 rate that you might intend to charge in that  
20 regard?

21 A \$225 an hour.

22 Q As we sit here now, just best  
23 estimate, sir, what's your estimate of how many  
24 hours that you've spent in reviewing the records  
25 and/or speaking with me and now giving your  
00099

Objection (96:23 to 97:16)

-402  
-602  
-611 (c)  
-No foundation  
-Misrepresents prior  
testimony  
-701  
-702  
-801  
-802  
-Improper opinion  
testimony from NRE  
-Misleading

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (97:17 to 97:20)

-402  
-611 (c)

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (98:9 to 99:13):

-402  
-611 (c)

Ruling: Overruled.

Bartlett v Mutual

1 deposition for a couple, three hours?

2 A In addition to the time today, I  
3 believe approximately two hours of time prior to  
4 that.

5 Q Would it be fair to say, Dr. Stein,  
6 that while you've been kind enough at my request  
7 to review your old medical records from  
8 Spaulding Rehab of your care and treatment of  
9 Karen Bartlett and I have agreed to compensate  
10 you for your time away from your medical  
11 practice that I have not retrained you in any  
12 way in relation to this lawsuit?

13 A Correct.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 123:4 - 124:24

4 Q Dr. Stein, has all of your  
5 testimony that you provided today been to your  
6 ability based on a reasonable degree of medical  
7 certainty or probability?

8 A I'm not sure I fully understand  
9 that term, but to the best of my understanding  
10 of that term, yes.

11 Q Do you recall the questions you  
12 were asked by counsel for the defendant  
13 regarding whether or not you've published or  
14 gotten sought or received grants regarding  
15 studying the cause or etiology of TEN or adverse  
16 reactions?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Have you ever published or sought  
19 grants regarding the proper utilization of  
20 NG-tubes or G-tubes or the treatment of VRE  
21 bacteremia, SVTs, ARDS, DVT or maintaining  
22 proper anticoagulation levels, any of those  
23 things?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Which ones?

00124

1 A I've published a little bit on the  
2 use of anticoagulation and the risk of false --  
3 on anticoagulation, and I have published on the  
4 use of feeding tubes, gastrostomy tubes in  
5 stroke survivors.

6 Q Got ya. The other area is  
7 NG-tubes, VRE bacteremias, SVTs, ARDS, DVTs.  
8 You've never published or sought any grant  
9 moneys to research those areas, fair?

10 A That is correct.

11 Q Nonetheless, do you consider  
12 yourself capable and qualified of knowing how  
13 and when and why to prescribe and administer  
14 NG-tubes and competent and qualified to know  
15 how, when, and why to manage and respond to or  
16 refer to specialists if you are dealing with VRE  
17 bacteremia, SVTs, ARDS and DVT?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Simply stated, is it fair to state  
20 that you have expertise as the medical doctor

Objection:  
-402

Ruling: Overruled.



Bartlett v Mutual

21 you are, double board-certified, licensed in two  
22 states, professor at Harvard for many, many  
23 years, in many areas that you've never published  
24 and never sought any grant money for?

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 125:2 - 125:4

2 A I would agree that I have expertise  
3 in areas outside of those in which I have  
4 published or sought grant funding.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 125:13 - 125:20

Speaking of food

14 additives, Dr. Stein, have you ever heard of a  
15 study that links causally or that provides  
16 evidence to anyone's estimation of a causal  
17 relationship between food additives on the one  
18 hand and getting TEN on the other hand?  
19 A I'm not familiar with any such  
20 study.

Objection:  
-402  
-602  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 126:1 - 127:14

Have you ever heard

2 of any published case series or even a single  
3 case report or any doctor in your career ever  
4 musing, diagnosing, or concluding that any  
5 patient in the history of the world has ever  
6 gotten TEN, toxic epidural necrolysis, from a  
7 food additive?

8 A With the exception of this  
9 particular case where there is speculation about  
10 the role of food, I'm not familiar with any  
11 other reports.

12 Q Is it correct to state that you  
13 understood, even though you are not a burn  
14 surgeon, but you were the director of burn  
15 rehabilitation at Spaulding Rehab for  
16 approximately eight or ten years that you then  
17 understood and still now understand that TEN is  
18 an extremely serious disease, defining serious  
19 as having a very high risk of death and often  
20 involving ocular complications including  
21 blindness?

22 A That is consistent with my  
23 understanding of TEN, yes.

24 Q And when you mentioned to counsel  
25 for the defendant that if you were to -- I think  
00127

1 you used the word critique your discharge  
2 summary, you might have mentioned her eye  
3 involvement.

Objection (126:1 to 126:11):  
-402  
-602  
-No foundation

Ruling: Overruled.

Objection (126:12 to 126:23):  
-402  
-602  
-No foundation  
-701  
-702  
-Improper opinion by NRE

Ruling: Sustained.

Objection (126:24 to 127:16):  
-402  
-602  
-No foundation  
-701  
-702  
-Improper opinion by NRE

Ruling: Overruled.

Bartlett v Mutual

4 Would it be fair to say that if, in  
5 fact, it is true that as we sit here in August  
6 2009, Karen Bartlett has undergone eight  
7 different eye surgeries all under the care of  
8 Mass Eye & Ear Infirmary and might soon undergo  
9 a ninth and has extremely limited vision, many  
10 doctors would define it as legally blind in both  
11 eyes, those are, if true, rather severe  
12 complications which have lasted at least  
13 approximately four years beyond your last care  
14 and treatment, fair?

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 127:16 - 128:6

16 A Yes, I would agree.  
17 Q Do you recall the defense  
18 attorney's questions regarding a history of  
19 atopic conditions?  
20 A Yes.  
21 Q And you mentioned there is a note  
22 of eczema somewhere in the record?  
23 A Yes.  
24 Q What is an atopic condition?  
25 A I'm not an expert in atopic  
00128  
1 dermatitis, but generally it's sort of a skin  
2 rash typically that often characterizes eczema,  
3 as well. People with atopic dermatitis or  
4 eczema are also prone to certain other allergic  
5 phenomenon or, for example, they may have asthma  
6 or related conditions.

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 128:9 - 128:24

Have you ever heard of  
10 either a study linking or a study purporting to  
11 provide evidence in favor of a causal link  
12 between or have you ever heard of a case series  
13 or case report or have you ever heard of a  
14 doctor in your entire career opine, conclude,  
15 surmise, mention that any atopic condition on  
16 the one hand might be a cause for toxic  
17 epidermal necrolysis on the other hand?  
18 A I'm not familiar with any such  
19 literature, again, reminding you that I'm not  
20 someone that follows this literature, and I  
21 couldn't speculate on what might be published  
22 that I haven't read.  
23 MR. JENSEN: After the word  
24 literature, nonresponsive.

<p>Objection (128:9 to 128:22): -402 -602 -No foundation -701 -702 -Improper opinion by NRE</p>	<p>Ruling: Overruled.</p>
---	---------------------------

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 129:2 - 129:11

Bartlett v Mutual

2 Q And have you ever heard any doctor  
3 in your entire career conclude, opine, mention  
4 that they believe some atopic condition had ever  
5 caused TEN in any patient of theirs or any  
6 patient they knew of?

7 A No.

8 Q And what your discharge summary  
9 stated -- tell me when you are there, please,  
10 sir.

11 A Yes, I'm there.

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 130:13 - 130:25

13 Is your entry of previously healthy  
14 woman in your discharge summary, is what that  
15 means, Doctor, is from your perspective from all  
16 the information you had, (a) to the extent you  
17 looked at electronic records from Mass General,  
18 and (b) from all the physicians that and other  
19 health care providers with whom you worked at  
20 Spaulding, there is nothing about Ms. Bartlett's  
21 history which contributed to any of the  
22 conditions you treated, other than the NSAID,  
23 which was identified in the Spaulding records by  
24 the Mass Eye & Ear Infirmary doctors as Sulindac  
25 or the concept that was floated of some food?

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 131:3 - 131:16

3 A The statement said that she was  
4 previously healthy it's an overall  
5 characterization of her state of health. I  
6 wouldn't read it as anything more than that.

7 Q Referring you, Doctor, to Exhibit  
8 32. Tell me when you are there, please.

9 A Okay.

10 Q Those six pages are four consults  
11 from Mass Eye & Ear, one consult from Mass  
12 General burn surgery and one consult from Mass  
13 General radiology for a G-tube placement. And  
14 all six of them all identify an allergy to NSAID  
15 and specifically identifies Sulindac and no  
16 other NSAID, correct?

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 131:19 - 132:10

19 A Just to clarify, these forms which  
20 were sent from Spaulding to the outside  
21 facilities all list nonsteroidal  
22 anti-inflammatory drugs, as well as Sulindac as  
23 allergies, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs  
24 being a broader category that includes Sulindac.  
25 That was recorded by the Spaulding nursing or

Bartlett v Mutual

00132

1 clerical staff from the record of allergies.

2 Q Thank you, Doctor.

3 And you've never seen any reference

4 to any NSAID other than Sulindac at any

5 Spaulding record or any Mass General record; is

6 that correct?

7 A I have not seen any.

8 MR. JENSEN: Thank you again

9 for your excellent care and

10 treatment of Karen Bartlett, Doctor.

---

Witness\_ Joel Stein, M.D. - Vol. 1.txt: 135:4 - 135:20

4 Q Doctor, have you ever heard anyone  
5 in the history of medicine suggest that when you  
6 start taking a medication like Phenytoin, brand  
7 name Dilantin, well after you get TEN, like in  
8 this example that the defense attorney just  
9 showed you on May 8th, and she had TEN by  
10 February 2nd or February 4th at the latest, so  
11 this is three months and about five days later,  
12 have you ever heard anyone suggest that taking a  
13 drug three months after you get TEN might have  
14 caused your TEN three months before then?

15 A No.

16 Q Simply stated, a drug can't  
17 possibly cause a disease when you had that  
18 disease three months before you took the drug;  
19 is that a fair and correct statement?

20 A Yes.

Objection:  
-402

Ruling: Sustained (from line 132:8  
through 135:20).

**Deposition of Joel Stein, M.D. – August 6, 2009**

**Pg: 18 Ln: 1 - 5**

**RULING:**

Sustained.

**Objection:** Irrelevant.

**Annotation:**

18: 1 Q Do you know whether or not you  
2 would have had access to that page after Karen  
3 Bartlett was transferred to Spaulding  
4 Rehabilitation Hospital?  
5 A It's unlikely.

**Pg: 18 Ln: 6 - 10**

**RULING:**

Sustained

**Objection:** Irrelevant.

**Annotation:**

18: 6 Q Exhibit 23 is a typed-up physical  
7 therapy service record.  
8 Would you have had access to that  
9 document at Spaulding?  
10 A I don't believe so.

**Pg: 25 Ln: 8 - 15**

**RULING:**

Sustained.

**Objection:** Irrelevant.

**Annotation:**

25: 8 Would you have likely seen Exhibits  
9 29 and 30, which are the history and physical  
10 and discharge summary respectively from  
11 Northeast Rehab Hospital?  
12 A Most likely not. Occasionally  
13 these records are duplicated, xeroxed and sent  
14 with the patient's chart, but I would say that's  
15 infrequent and unlikely to have been the case.

**Pg: 91 Ln: 15 - 23**

**RULING:**

Overruled.

**Objection:** Irrelevant.  
Rule 401.  
Rule 403.  
Rule 26(a)(2)(A).

**Annotation:**

91:15 And in your second sentence you  
16 write, "the exact etiology was" -- you are  
17 referring to her TEN and it says -- "exact  
18 etiology was unclear. The possibility of  
19 nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs" -- or  
20 NSAIDs for short -- "or some food were  
21 considered."  
22 Is that what you wrote?  
23 A That's what I wrote.

**Pg: 110 Ln: 8 - 25**

**RULING:**

Overruled.

**Objection:** Subject of Plaintiff's Motion In Limine No. 14  
Rule 401.  
Rule 403.  
Rule 26(a)(2)(A).

**Annotation:**

110: 8 Q We had marked this document  
9 previously. I don't remember what the exact  
10 number was, but this is the document that in the  
11 first paragraph "history of present illness  
12 provides the exact etiology was unclear, though  
13 the possibility of nonsteroidal  
14 anti-inflammatory drugs or some food was  
15 considered." Did I read that correctly?  
16 A Yes.  
17 Q And that's your statement, Doctor?  
18 A It is.  
19 Q What is etiology?  
20 A Cause.  
21 Q Did you reach any conclusion to a  
22 reasonable degree of medical or scientific  
23 certainty about the cause of Mrs. Bartlett's  
24 condition?  
25 A No.

**Pg: 118 Ln: 4 - 6**

**RULING:**

Overruled.

**Objection:** Subject of Plaintiff's Motion In Limine No. 14  
Rule 401.  
Rule 403.  
Rule 26(a)(2)(A).

**Annotation:**

118: 4 Q Would you agree that an opinion on  
5 that issue would be beyond what you saw and what  
6 you did to and for Ms. Bartlett?

**Pg: 118 Ln: 17 - 23**

**RULING:**

Overruled.

**Objection:** Subject of Plaintiff's Motion In Limine No. 14  
Rule 401.  
Rule 403.  
Rule 26(a)(2)(A).

**Annotation:**

118:17 Q Doctor, my question is a little  
18 different. If I understand your prior testimony  
19 correctly, tell me if I'm wrong, but as you sit  
20 here today, you do not have an opinion to a  
21 reasonable degree of scientific medical  
22 certainty about what caused Ms. Bartlett's SJS  
23 or TEN?

**Pg: 120 Ln: 1 - 6**

**RULING:**

Overruled.

**Objection:** No Question asked.

**Annotation:**

120: 1 A The impression that -- from the  
2 prior physicians that cared for her and carried  
3 forward in my notes is that it was due to an  
4 uncertain cause, perhaps a nonsteroidal  
5 antiinflammatory medication, perhaps food  
6 related.

**Pg: 120 Ln: 7 - 10**

**RULING:**

Overruled.

**Objection:** Irrelevant.  
Rule 26(a)(2)(A).

**Annotation:**

120: 7 Q So your testimony is consistent  
8 with the statement in your discharge summary,  
9 correct?  
10 A Correct.

**Pg: 120 Ln: 22 - Pg: 121 Ln: 6**

**RULING:**

Sustained.

**Objection:** Subject of Plaintiff's Motion In Limine No. 14  
Rule 401.  
Rule 403.  
Rule 26(a)(2)(A).

**Annotation:**

120:22 Do you know if Ms. Bartlett had a  
23 history of atopic conditions prior to the  
24 incident that required your care and treatment?  
25 A I don't recall seeing that in the  
121: 1 record. It was indicated. I'm sorry. If you  
2 look at page 9 of the -- what do they call them?  
3 Q The Bates number?  
4 A Bates number, thank you.  
5 Eczema is listed as a past medical  
6 history item.

**Pg: 121 Ln: 7 - 13**

**RULING:**

Sustained as to  
lines 121:11 through  
121:13. Otherwise  
overruled.

**Objection:** Irrelevant.

**Annotation:**

121: 7 Q How many patients have you treated,  
8 Doctor, that have experienced SJS or TEN?  
9 A I'm not certain. If I had to make  
10 an estimate, it would be less than five.  
11 Q Is SJS and TEN a rare condition?  
12 A I'm not sure the definition of  
13 rare, but it is, I would say, relatively rare.



**Pg: 121 Ln: 14 - 18**

**RULING:**

Sustained.

**Objection:** Rule 401.  
Rule 26(a)(2)(A).

**Annotation:**

121:14 Q Do you have an understanding one  
15 way or the other if SJS and TEN are a recognized  
16 adverse event with a wide variety of drugs?  
17 A That is my understanding, that  
18 there are multiple causes.

**Pg: 132 Ln: 16 - 24**

**RULING:**

Sustained.

**Objection:** Rule 401.  
Rule 403.  
Rule 26(a)(2)(A).

**Annotation:**

132:16 Q You've been asked a couple of times  
17 now about all kinds of literature concerning a  
18 possible association between NSAIDs and SJS or  
19 TEN, and I think basically you've testified that  
20 you don't follow the literature in that regard.  
21 And my question to you specifically  
22 is that following the literature in that regard,  
23 would any event be outside the course and scope  
24 of your treatment of Ms. Bartlett, correct?

**Pg: 133 Ln: 11 - 13**

**RULING:**

Overruled.

**Objection:** Irrelevant.  
Improper inclusion of statement by Counsel which cannot  
possibly be evidence or relevant.

**Annotation:**

133:11 treatment at Spaulding, do you know if she  
12 received a medication called Phenytoin?  
13 MR. JENSEN: Can you say that

**Pg: 134 Ln: 19 - 24**

**RULING:**

Sustained.

**Objection:** Rule 26(a)(2)(A).  
Irrelevant.  
Rule 401.  
Rule 403.

**Annotation:**

134:19 Q Do you know if Phenytoin sodium has  
20 been associated with SJS or TEN?  
21 A Absolutely. That's a yes. It is  
22 one of the more, to my limited knowledge of the  
23 field, one of the more commonly identified  
24 causes.

**Plaintiff's Counter Designation.**

**Pg: 135 Ln: 4 - 20**

**Annotation:**

Objection  
sustained  
(see infra)

135: 4 Q Doctor, have you ever heard anyone  
5 in the history of medicine suggest that when you  
6 start taking a medication like Phenytoin, brand  
7 name Dilantin, well after you get TEN, like in  
8 this example that the defense attorney just  
9 showed you on May 8th, and she had TEN by  
10 February 2nd or February 4th at the latest, so  
11 this is three months and about five days later,  
12 have you ever heard anyone suggest that taking a  
13 drug three months after you get TEN might have  
14 caused your TEN three months before then?  
15 A No.  
16 Q Simply stated, a drug can't  
17 possibly cause a disease when you had that  
18 disease three months before you took the drug;  
19 is that a fair and correct statement?  
20 A Yes.

**JOEL STEIN DEPOSITION – AUGUST 6, 2009**

**Pg: 49 Ln: 15 - 25**

**Annotation:**

49:15 A Right. I think it says that on top  
16 because that's who the appointment was made  
17 with; however, it seems quite clear that  
18 Dr. Tsai wrote this note. I imagine she saw the  
19 patient. I don't know who Dr. Azar was. It's  
20 possible he was a resident or fellow.  
21 I don't -- it's really difficult  
22 for me to determine each person's role, but it  
23 seems fairly clear that Dr. Tsai did, in fact,  
24 evaluate the patient and wrote this note on May  
25 9th.

**RULING:**

Sustained.

**OBJECTION: No question. Irrelevant.**

**Pg: 112 Ln: 10 - 17**

**Annotation:**

112:10 Q Do you have an understanding, one  
11 way or another, if there are food additives that  
12 can cause Stevens-Johnson syndrome or TEN?  
13 A I'm unaware. I don't know.  
14 Q Just so I understand your testimony  
15 correctly, you did not diagnose Stevens-Johnson  
16 syndrome or TEN in Ms. Bartlett, correct?  
17 A No, I did not.

**RULING:**

Overruled.

**OBJECTION: The first question and answer are irrelevant. The fact that he has no knowledge on a topic defines irrelevance. It is also the lack of an undesignated opinion.**

**Pg: 113 Ln: 7 - 17**

**Annotation:**

113: 7 Q As I understand your prior  
8 testimony, you were unable because you were not  
9 available at the facility to treat Ms. Bartlett  
10 for the entire course of her stay at Spaulding  
11 Rehab; is that correct?  
12 A I was only available for a portion  
13 of it, that's correct.  
14 Q Why were you unavailable for a  
15 portion of her treatment?  
16 A I'm not certain. I'm guessing I  
17 was on vacation, but I really don't know.

**RULING:**

Sustained.

**OBJECTION:**

**Second question and answer are irrelevant.**

**Pg: 113 Ln: 24 - Pg: 114 Ln: 20**

**Annotation:**

113:24 Q Can you read for me or I'll read  
25 it, sir, on hospital course, which is Exhibit 4,  
114: 1 page 3, bottom of the page, "patient was  
2 admitted for multidisciplinary rehabilitation  
3 program. She made steady gains in all areas.  
4 Her skin healed well, and she had no significant  
5 open lesions at the time of discharge. She was  
6 advised to use moisturizers and avoid sun  
7 exposure."  
8 A That's correct.  
9 Q "The patient made steady gains with  
10 regard to her respiratory function. She was  
11 decannulated and had no further difficulty with  
12 regard to her pulmonary function."  
13 Did I read that correctly, sir?  
14 A Yes.  
15 Q And, Doctor, can you tell me if  
16 that is a fair and accurate summary of her  
17 condition at the time she left Spaulding Rehab  
18 Hospital?

19 A Those statements are fair and  
20 accurate. There are other statements that I

**RULING:**

Overruled.

**OBJECTION:** The remaining portion of his answer after “accurate” should not be excluded as it is responsive to the question.

**Pg: 116 Ln: 8 - Pg: 117 Ln: 3**

**Annotation:**

116: 8 Q Did Mr. Jensen comment to you about  
9 the claims or defenses in the lawsuit?

10 A He indicated the lawsuit was  
11 contending that the nonsteroidal  
12 anti-inflammatory medication was the cause of  
13 her TEN and subsequent medical conditions, so  
14 that's sort of the essence of the lawsuit.

15 Q Did he identify for you which  
16 nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory medication was  
17 allegedly at issue?

18 A I believe he said Sulindac. He may  
19 have used the generic name. I don't recall.

20 Q Do you have an understanding if  
21 Sulindac is a generic or branded product?

22 A You know, I'm not certain.

23 Q There was some discussion about  
24 your review of the scientific literature. Did,  
25 in fact, you review any of the scientific

117: 1 literature concerning adverse drug events prior  
2 to the deposition today?

3 A No.

**RULING:**

Sustained as to  
lines 116:8  
through 117:3.

**OBJECTION:** The questions at lines 20 & 23 are irrelevant.